

LITERARY
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. XX.—DECEMBER, 1838.

ART. I.—MACINTOSH'S THEORY OF MORAL SENTIMENTS.

*Progress of Ethical Philosophy. By the Right Hon. Sir James Macintosh.
Sec. Ed. Carey, Lea, & Blanchard: Phil.*

THE high merits of this work are well known. Many readers have derived both profit and delight from its pages. But still it has its faults; and some of these are, in our opinion, of no trifling importance. We allude, in particular, to those portions of the work in which man's accountability for his belief is denied, and in which an attempt is made to reconcile the "feeling of liberty" with the "doctrine of necessity." It is not our intention, however, to examine these remarkable passages at present: we shall confine our attention to another and very prominent feature of the same volume. And considering their importance, we wonder why the speculations of this distinguished author concerning the Moral Sentiments, have not already attracted more attention from the friends of a pure and exalted morality.

If we are not greatly mistaken, the theory of Sir James in relation to the above subject is unfavourable to the best interests of moral science; and yet it has found many able advocates, and it is supposed to be the prevalent doctrine in England. Meanwhile, the principal reviews, both English and American, have kept an unaccountable silence; and we

regret that, with our comparatively feeble abilities, it remains for us to open the fire of opposition.

In the first place, we would offer one word in relation to the method which Sir James seems to have pursued. In examining a part of our mental constitution, the first question should always be,—what are the characteristics of the subject or thing under consideration? To begin with the inquiry into its origin, as our author seems to have done, is according to a distinguished philosopher, to mistake the true method of investigation at the very starting point. And the inquirer, whoever he may be, will almost inevitably fall into the error of Sir James; who has overlooked one of the real characteristics or distinguishing properties of Conscience, and substituted in its place a factitious property which renders its nature more consonant with its supposed origin.

Conscience is universally regarded as a principle which may be enlightened. Hence, such expressions as a well-informed or an ill-instructed conscience are frequently met with, both in books and in common conversation. And it will not be denied, that the feeling of moral approbation uniformly attaches to what we regard as right, and that the feeling of moral disapprobation as uniformly attaches to what we regard as wrong. It is then, according to the common sentiment of mankind, the office of conscience both to judge and to enforce its decision with the voice of authority. This is exactly the notion of Conscience entertained by bishop Butler; who considered it as including both “a perception of the understanding,” or reason, and “a feeling of the heart;” and those who are intimately acquainted with the writings of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, will readily perceive that it is not at all inconsistent with the views of that profound metaphysician and philosopher.

We are aware, that some writers employ the term Conscience to designate nothing more than the judgment, or more properly speaking, the “perception,” while others apply it exclusively to the “sentiment of the heart;” but, on this subject, we have taken the pains to have no controversy with our author about words. Sir James does not deny, that “a perception of the understanding,” or reason, is included in the idea of Conscience: on the contrary, he frequently recognises it to be a discerning faculty. He repeatedly ascribes to it the office of *judging* as well as of *commanding*. But, nevertheless, it is excluded by his system; and, if we

are not mistaken, it will be found to be irreconcilable with his theory of Moral Sentiments. If he had steadily borne in mind, that Conscience is not merely a sentiment of the heart, blindly impelling the will, like any other affection or desire; but that it is an intelligent principle, always acting according to knowledge, it would, we believe, have interposed, at every step of his progress, an insuperable barrier. But so far from bearing this in mind, he has not even mentioned this striking peculiarity of the moral faculty, in the list which he has given us of its characteristics. p. 122.

It was more agreeable to his theory, to consider Conscience under what we conceive to be a factitious light, and to ascribe to it another, though an unreal, distinguishing property. And whoever has not observed this fact, must have found his language in some places exceedingly dark and unintelligible. For example, in speaking of Butler, he says, "He only mentions the fact that Conscience commands other principles;" but he gives no solution of "the question, why, or how?" "Some of his own hints," he continues, "and some fainter intimations of Shaftsbury, might have led him to what appears to be the true solution; which, perhaps, from its extreme simplicity, has escaped him and his successors. The truth seems to be, that the moral sentiments in their mature state, are a class of feelings which have no other object but the mental disposition leading to voluntary action, and the voluntary actions which flow from these dispositions Nothing stands between the moral sentiments and their object. They are, as it were, in contact with the will. It is this sort of mental position, if the expression may be pardoned, that explains, or seems to explain, those characteristic properties which true philosophers ascribe to them, and which all reflecting men feel to belong to them." pp. 120, 121.

Now, it is admitted on both sides, that the power to discriminate between right and wrong, is one of these properties. But we confess, that we cannot see why conscience, (or the moral sentiments,) should possess the power of discriminating between right and wrong, merely because it stands in contact with the will. This mental position is, however, the only reason which our author assigns for the *discerning* and *imperative* character of conscience. And if we ask, why conscience does not approve involuntary acts which are useful, or the beneficial acts of inferior animals, as well as those which are voluntary? He answers: not because

there is any difference in their natures, but because conscience "has a direct action on the will, and a constant mental contiguity to it;" whereas, "it has no such mental contiguity to involuntary changes." (p. 265.) In short, this peculiar relation to the will is the great property of conscience which our author supposes to "imply and explain all the rest." And as it escaped the observation of Butler, it thereby gave rise, according to Sir James, to a defect in his system; inasmuch as it left him without the means of explaining, or *seeming* to explain, the question why, or how, conscience commands. For our part, we were utterly in the dark with respect to these portions of Sir James' lucubrations, until we came clearly to see that both this curious question and its solution were forced upon him by the necessities of a preconceived theory.

We are compelled to differ from our author, in saying this is "not an error, but a defect," in the system of Butler. (p. 119.) If it is either, it must be an error; for, according to Butler, conscience is an original and implanted principle; and he could have made no consistent attempt to trace the process by which it acquires the attributes of sovereignty and command. To use his own emphatic language, "it was wrought into our nature by the hand of God;" and it exercises authority over the world within, simply because it was made to exercise such authority. This is a question which, according to Butler's system, needed no explanation; and, consequently, his not having attempted to explain it, cannot be justly called a defect. But in the theory of Sir James Mackintosh, which holds the moral faculty to be one of secondary formation, it was necessary to show how, out of mere blind instinctive principles, another could be formed which should possess the discriminating and imperative character of conscience. And whether he has succeeded in this attempt, perhaps we shall not fail to discover.

We have already expressed the opinion, that the fundamental property ascribed to conscience by our author, is forced and unnatural. But on this point we shall adduce no proof: we shall simply submit the question to the tribunal of the reader's consciousness. This furnishes the best evidence in such matters; and besides, in discussing our author's account of the origin of conscience, we are perfectly willing to admit the above position to be correct. We shall content ourselves with calling in question other essential parts of his theory.

Association is another fundamental principle in the system of our author. By the process of association, the inferior principles of our nature undergo certain changes until they acquire an exclusive "regard to states of the will;" and having thus acquired the distinguishing quality of conscience, they are "capable of being absorbed into it, and of becoming a part of it." If the principle or property of which we have spoken, may be regarded as the key-stone of Sir James' theory, that of association may be considered as the instrument by which it is erected. Such is the general process by which conscience is supposed to be formed out of the other elements of our nature; but we shall arrive at greater satisfaction and clearness when we come to examine it more at large.

In order to evince its justness, the author has furnished us with three canons by which every sound theory, as he supposes, may be tested; 1. The principles employed in the theory should be known really to exist; 2. These principles should be known to produce effects *like* those ascribed to them in the theory; 3. The theory should correspond, if not with all the facts to be explained, at least with so great a majority of them as to render it highly probable that means will in time be found to reconcile it to all, p. 254.

It may be thought by some of his readers, that in certain cases one of these rules will imply another; that is, if a principle is known to produce effects *like* those ascribed to it in the theory, it must in certain cases, necessarily serve to explain the latter. But however this may be, a sound theory will certainly comply with all the above conditions; and if the hypothesis of Sir James should, on minute inspection, be found inconsistent with them, we may fairly reject it, and that on his own principles.

It is evident, at first sight, that his theory complies with the first of the above rules; inasmuch as the principle of association is really known to exist. But it is known to produce effects like those ascribed to it in the theory? To determine this question, we must first consider what effects the principle of association is known to produce. The most striking instance of its known effects is, according to our author himself, the formation of the secondary passion of avarice. Every man possesses certain natural desires: these superinduce the desire of money, the means by which they are gratified. As he continues to accumulate the means of

pleasure or gratification, the secondary desire becomes stronger and stronger; and, in process of time, it becomes an overmatch for that which gave it birth. Hence, although he possesses the means of gratification, he will not devote them to the purpose for which they were originally desired.

This process and its result are perfectly clear in the eye of consciousness. The miser must either forego the end, or else part with the means; and as his desire to possess the latter has become stronger than his desire to obtain the former, so that maintains over this an ascendant and withering influence. Is this effect *like* those ascribed to the same principle in the theory of our author? Let us see and compare. But, for an obvious reason, we prefer stating in his own words the effects supposed by him to result from the principle of association.

"When the social affections are formed, they are *actually followed in every instance by the will to do whatever can promote their object*. Compassion excites a voluntary determination to do whatever relieves the person pitied. The like process must occur in every case of gratitude, generosity, and affection. Nothing so uniformly follows the kind disposition as the act of will, because it is the only *means by which the benevolent desire can be gratified*. The result of what Brown justly calls a 'finer analysis' shows a mental contiguity of the affection to the volition to be much closer than appears on a coarser examination of this part of our nature. No wonder then, that the strongest association, the most active power of reciprocal suggestion, should subsist between them. As all the affections are delightful, so the volitions, *voluntary acts which are the only means of their gratifications*, become agreeable objects of contemplation to the mind. The habitual disposition to perform them is felt in ourselves, and observed in others with satisfaction. As these feelings become more lively, the absence of them may be viewed in ourselves as a pain, in others with an alienation capable of indefinite increase. They become entirely independent sentiments; still, however, receiving abundant supplies of nourishment from their parent affections, which, in well-balanced minds, reciprocally strengthen each other; unlike the unkind passions, which are constantly engaged in the most angry conflicts of civil war. In this state we desire to experience these beneficent volitions, to cultivate a disposition towards them, and to do every corresponding

voluntary act. *They are for their own sake the object of desire.* They thus constitute a large portion of those emotions, desires, and affections, which regard certain dispositions of the mind as their sole and ultimate end. These are what are called the moral sense, the moral sentiments, or best though most simply, by the ancient name of Conscience; which has the merit in our language, of being applied to no other purpose, which peculiarly marks the strong workings of these feelings on conduct, and which, from its solemn and sacred character, is well adapted to denote the venerable authority of the highest principle of human nature." p. 258.

According to this account of its formation, Conscience can exist only where it has been preceded by the practice of every virtue which it approves; and in order to make its existence universal, or to render all men accountable beings, it was necessary for the author to maintain, that the "act of the will uniformly follows the kind disposition." But how far is this from being consistent with the fact! Is compassion, for example, invariably followed by "the voluntary determination to do whatever relieves the person pitied?" The passive impressions or feelings of pity, it is well known, are sometimes permitted to pass away unimproved; the benevolent acts which they were designed to produce are not performed; until, in the end, they become dissociated from the will. They lose the power to move it. In such a case, the person would have no conscience, according to our author: and the mere sentimentalist, who has learned to drop a tear over the miseries of his brother, but who has never learned to relieve his distresses, is as far removed from the rank and accountability of a moral agent, as he is from having performed the duties which are appropriate to that rank.

In the second place, it is supposed that the means employed in the formation of Conscience, *are states of the will*; and that when we come to desire these for their own sakes, then are they capable of "being absorbed into Conscience:" just as when we come to desire money for its own sake, is this desire transformed into the passion of avarice. But how can such a comparison be made? In what intelligible sense can a benevolent affection be said to employ states of the will as means to an end? Every benevolent affection, we all know, is accompanied with a desire to promote the happiness of its object. And whenever an opportunity offers, if the affection be real, sound and unobstructed in its course,

it will go forth in voluntary acts to bless its object. In every such case, the state of the will, or, more properly speaking, the state of the mind in willing, follows the desire to do good. The state of the will is the spontaneous result of a principle of our nature; and to compare it to a means adopted for the accomplishment of an end, is, if we do not see amiss, a manifest and gross abuse of language. And we should believe that we had misunderstood Sir James, if the idea we attach to his language were not necessary to the validity of his argument, and to the stability of his system.

Again: when the secondary passion of avarice is fully formed, the desire or desires from which it sprang, cease to actuate the mind; but this is not the case with the benevolent affections after conscience has been formed from them. Avarice crushes its parent affection; but, in the theory, the original and secondary desires "reciprocally strengthen each other." The sentiments of secondary formation in the theory, receive "constant supplies of nourishment from their parent affections; whereas, the secondary passion out of the theory receives no such supply, as it goes on from strength to strength, single-handed. In the known case, we see two antagonist desires—we see the one gradually yielding to the increasing vehemence of the other—we see the latter gaining the entire ascendancy over the other, and over the whole man. But, in the supposed case, we see a single affection partly transformed, from time to time, into a "component part of conscience," without losing aught of its original fulness and vigor. In the known case, it is necessary to the formation of the secondary passion that it should become stronger than the original desire; on the contrary, in the supposed case, no such necessity exists; and, in fact, Conscience is frequently weaker than the private and social affections from which it is supposed to be derived.

The parallel fails in another most important particular. When money comes to be loved for its own sake, to the exclusion of the object for which it was at first so eagerly accumulated; this is but the transfer, by association, of a desire from one object to another, or the prevalence of one desire over its antagonist. There is no change in the *nature* of the mental affection. It was a desire at first, and it is a desire still; remaining the same and unaltered in *kind*. But the affect ascribed to the principle of association in the theory, is that of changing a mental affection from one *kind* into

another; for, as Butler has well said, Conscience is superior "in nature and in kind" to the other principles of our moral constitution:—a position for which Sir James is himself a strenuous advocate.

The parallel appears to fail in every particular; and a close inspection shows a real difference, where our author has only fancied a resemblance, or unwittingly created a seeming one by an arbitrary use of language.

The natural passion of anger is supposed to contribute its share towards the formation of our moral sentiments. "We cultivate a natural anger against oppression, which guards ourselves against the practice of that vice, and because the manifestation of it deters others from its exercise. The first rude resentment of a child is against every instrument of hurt. We confine it to intentional hurt, *when we are taught by experience that it prevents only that species of hurt*; and at last it is still further limited to wrong done to ourselves or others. and in that case becomes a purely moral sentiment." p. 145.

We can see how, in the theory at least, the natural passion of anger undergoes certain limitations, until its operations are narrowed down to intentional hurt, or voluntary injury; but we do not see how it has acquired the new characteristic, not only of resenting voluntary hurt exclusively, but also of condemning it as *wrong*. We see how the sphere of its operations has been circumscribed; but we do not see how its very nature has been changed. In truth, we may limit and circumscribe the operations of anger as we please—we may increase its strength and vehemence to the utmost degree of intensity—we may cause it to burn to the very centre of the soul—and still it will remain different in nature and in kind from the feeling of wrong, the sentiment of moral disapprobation. The great change which a blind anger must undergo, before it can be assimilated to the discriminating and imperative character of conscience, is not accounted for in the theory, but assumed. Just at the convenient moment, the needful transformation happens to it, we see not why nor how.

We shall notice one more instance of the changes ascribed to the principle of association; because it will serve, if we are not mistaken, to illustrate the extravagant lengths into which the finest intellects may be seduced by the love of theory. We desire the praise of our fellow men.

Praise-worthiness is one of the means by which it may be acquired. Now, let us suppose, in order to meet the demands of the theory, that it were possible for a man to pursue praise-worthiness or virtue, merely from the desire to obtain praise; and then the theory will carry out the remainder of the process with unspeakable ease. For "as we gradually transfer our desire from praise to praise-worthiness, this principle also is adopted into conscience." p. 170. Ay, and we shall henceforth seek praise-worthiness for its own sake! Thus the disciple of Mandeville, who begins the practice of virtue merely to obtain praise, may, in the end, pursue it, for its own sake, in spite of scorn, persecution and death!

From what precedes, we think we may be justified in the conclusion, that the principle of association is not known to produce effects *like* those ascribed to it in the theory, and that it will not serve to explain the facts observed. And hence, the theory of our author does not comply with the second or third canon laid down by himself.

But, to our great surprise, Sir James leaves the light of consciousness, and the world of mind, to roam abroad in the region of matter for illustration and proof. What can be meant by such a step? Does he intend to employ the principle of mental association to explain the phenomena of the material world? Greatly, indeed, must his intellectual vision have been dazzled by the law of association, if he imagined that he could see it every where; not only presiding over the empire of mind, and giving rise to all its complicated workings and revolutions, but exerting its omnipresent power in forming the material elements into new compounds. But if *association* be not a law of matter, to what purpose are material changes adduced to illustrate those affected by it in mind? Let us quote one of these passages.

"The whole creation teems with instances where the most powerful agents and the most lasting bodies are the acknowledged results of combination, sometimes of a few, often of many elements. These compounds often in their turn become the elements of other substances: and it is with them that we are chiefly conversant in the pursuits of knowledge, solely in the concerns of life. No man ever fancied, that because they are compounds, they were therefore the less *real*. It is impossible to confound them with any of the separate elements which contribute to their formation. But

a much more close resemblance presents itself. Every secondary desire, or acquired relish, involves in it a transfer of pleasure to something which was before indifferent or disagreeable. Is the new pleasure the less real for being acquired? Is it not often preferred to the original enjoyment?" p. 256.

There are other passages fully as strong, if not stronger, in which Sir James endeavours to fortify his theory by analogies drawn from matter. But when the question relates to our mental processes and changes, no testimony can be lawfully admitted but that of consciousness. Matter and mind are so wholly unlike in all that we know or can comprehend of them, that the properties and operations of the former can throw no light whatever upon those of the latter. And if we must use metaphors and comparisons, if we must employ language borrowed from material objects, in discussing the subjects of mental and moral science; this should be merely with the view of referring the mind back to its own consciousness; and if the point to be established cannot be made manifest by that inward light, it should not be permitted to hold any place among the truths of intellectual and moral philosophy. In these departments of science, no *proof* should ever be attempted from the world of matter; and all our anxiety should be to guard against its delusive analogies. And if this fundamental canon, so long ago and so irreversibly established, be not rigidly observed, we must expect that mental and moral philosophy will continue to run out into all the wild and phantastic vagaries of unbridled hypothesis.

In this connexion, it is of importance to remark, that Sir James does not even pretend to have the direct evidence of consciousness in support of his theory. The transformations of which it speaks are admitted to have taken place in a dark and unremembered period of our existence. But the same objection, he alleges, would prove as fatal to Berkley's theory of acquired perception as to his theory of acquired conscience. But the principles which bishop Berkley employs are known to produce effects like those ascribed to them in his theory, and they will also serve to explain the facts for which it contends. And besides, in the case of the blind man couched by Cheselden, we are furnished with one actual instance of the process by which the power of perception is acquired; whereas we have been furnished with

no such instance with regard to the actual formation of conscience.

It will occur, perhaps, to the reader of the theory in question to ask, why may not the worst portions of our nature, as well as the more amiable and lovely, be transformed into Conscience? Avarice, no less than compassion, employs "states of the will;" and it employs them exactly in the same manner. Why may not the former, then, as well as the latter, acquire "an exclusive regard to states of the will;" which is the property of Conscience that is supposed to "imply and explain all the rest?" Why may not this, as well as any other affection of the mind, become "capable of being absorbed in Conscience," by acquiring the only quality which is supposed to be necessary to such an absorption? Of this question, the author of the theory has furnished no solution.

Before we conclude, we would offer a word with respect to the tendency of the theory which we have opposed. If we had regarded it as a mere matter of speculation, which is likely to produce no evil fruit, we should have left it to the discussion of others. But we think it calculated to exert a pernicious influence; because it annihilates the inherent excellency and glory of virtue. The only real difference which it recognizes between dispositions or actions is, that some are useful as means to an end, while others are not. Virtue is taken up, in the first place, as a means to an end; just as a man seeks money on account of its subserviency to some further object. The virtuous man, it is true, becomes perfectly disinterested in his virtue; ultimately he pursues virtue for its own sake; but this is not because he discovers any new excellency in it, any more than the miser discovers any new quality in his bags of gold and silver. Conscience approves virtue—but why? not because she beholds its intrinsic beauty, but because her contemplation of it is exclusive. It is owing to the mental position of Conscience, which "ascends not beyond the heart of man," that "moral approbation *must* be limited to voluntary operations." (pp. 173, 266.) Moral approbation is not the result of discrimination, but of a blind necessity. The feeling of moral distinctions is a delusion engendered by habit and association. The feeling itself is real; but it has no real foundation in the nature of things. Is it not evident that a theory which gives such low and degrading views of the transcendent and

immutable glory of virtue, must tend to impair our respect for it, and thereby divert the mind from the highest and purest fountain of human happiness?

In the beginning of this article we made some allusion to the false method to which the theory under consideration owes its existence. Hartley has informed us of the manner in which he was led to embrace and advocate this theory. He began, as he tells us, by trying the power of the principle of association; by trying whether it could not be made to account for all our intellectual pleasures and pains. He undertook to ascertain the origin of the various parts and operations of the mind, or rather to trace them all up to the same origin, before he had carefully observed their several characteristics. How many false theories have arisen from the same prolific, from the same inexhaustible source! One person adopts the principle of self-love, because he happens to see how it will serve to explain a few of our mental phenomena; and, for the sake of a grand simplification, it must be made to explain all the rest. Another seizes upon sympathy, a third upon association, and each proceeds to take such a view of facts as will enable him with the greater ease to reduce them all to his own favorite classification, or mode of explanation. By the aid of a lively fancy, a good deal of coloring, and, above all, the ambiguities of language, the true nature of things is most strangely disguised; and all, however unlike in themselves, are made to appear in one grand array with the same regimentals on;—whilst the theoriser himself stands forth as the captain of the host!

And such will continue to be the course of men for centuries to come. Yet let us take encouragement, as well as warning. For order and light, real and not apparent only, will ultimately rise out of confusion and darkness. If the systems which spring from human ingenuity, may, at first sight, strike the mind with their regularity and beauty; yet, let us recollect that they are destined soon to pass away. The system which Descartes has given us of the material universe, for example, was adapted to captivate the mind; because its immense fabric, because its wide inductions, were based upon a few particulars within the reach of all. By recommending itself to the natural indolence of the human mind, as well as to its passionate love of general principles, it was calculated to make proselytes among the ignorant as well as among the learned. But it was com

pelled, in spite of all its captivating charms, to shrink into nothing before the irresistible manifestation of the truth.

Newton unveiled the true system of the universe. His facts are as broad as his principles. His foundation is laid as deep as that of nature itself. And hence, although his system, as has been well said, does not give the mind so much pleasure in reading it; yet it will outlive ten thousand such fanciful hypotheses as that of the immortal French philosopher. If, from the causes above intimated, error has the advantage over truth in the rapidity of her marches; the latter possesses, in many cases, the inconceivable advantage that her conquests are everlasting.

But such views as those unfolded by Newton are not to be obtained, in any department of science, without much toil and self-denial. To recur to our former example, the disciple of Descartes may see all the order and beauty of his master's system at once; and he may be charmed before its evanescent glories have time to fade from his eyes. But the disciple of Newton must hear much apparent discord before he can enjoy the high privilege of listening to the music of the spheres. Like the Christian, he must depend upon promises at first, and he must pass through the valley of self-denial and humility, in order to reach that loftiest eminence ever attained by man, from whence he may look abroad, not upon the production of hypothesis and fancy, but upon the unrivalled glory of God's own creation.

ART. II.—THOUGHTS ON THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF MAN'S DEPENDENCE.

By REV. ISAAC PARSONS, East Haddam, Conn.

THE Christian world is divided in opinion on many subjects, but on no one does this difference result in wider discrepancies than on that of human dependence. This may be regarded as one of the starting points of difference of opinion in the Theological discussions of this age. There are not a few, who take the side of Arminians and Pelagians in these discussions, who have formerly ranked with Calvinists, and who still claim to be Calvinists, while in their

views of man's dependence, they are in fact with Pelagians and Arminians, and are found carrying out their heretical views on other subjects in Theology. It is not my design to trace minutely the distinction between Calvinists on the one hand, and Arminians and Pelagians on the other, in regard to human dependence, nor to show the influence of this in determining their respective views of the doctrines and duties of religion, but my design is simply to present a few thoughts on the nature and extent of man's dependence.

It is admitted by all who are believers in revelation, that mankind are the creatures of God, that to him they owe both their creation and preservation, yet among believers in revelation there are diversities of opinion in regard to the nature of man's dependence on God. As mankind are free, moral, and accountable agents, it is contended by some that this dependence must differ in kind or degree from the dependence of material existence, and hence, they would restrict dependence to the existence of man at first, and to his general preservation. On the contrary, Calvinists hold to entire and absolute dependence in man on God. Yet they admit the freedom of the human will, and hold to human accountability as really and as fully as others, who limit man's dependence in accomodation to their preconceived views of free agency.

It is important for all, of every name and class, to be established in scriptural views on this subject, and also, that all should be ready to acknowledge and to feel their dependence in its full extent as taught in the Holy Scriptures. I shall, I. Inquire as to the nature of man's dependence on God. II. As to its extent.

I. The nature of man's dependence on God. Man is a complex being, uniting soul and body in his person, having an animal nature and a moral existence, yet man in both natures, in soul and in body, is the creation of God, the workmanship of his hands, as really so, as any portion of the inanimate creation. He was brought into existence without any will or agency of his own, and he is in his structure as to body and soul, such a creature, endowed with such powers and capacities as God chose to see in him. The dependence of man on God for existence is as absolute as that of inanimate matter. And what is there in the nature of man's dependence, that should distinguish it from the dependence of other effects of creative power? It is true, that as a

moral agent, he is constituted with faculties which give him a higher rank in the scale of being than irrational creatures, but this higher rank does not prove that he is any the less dependent on God, or that dependence in his case differs in its nature from dependence in other creatures, unless it should appear from other sources of knowledge that man is less under the controul of God than other creatures. Irrational creatures have a distinct organization, and are distinct agents, yet absolutely under the controul of God and completely in his hands! And why should we infer any thing different from this in regard to the dependence of men as the creatures of God, though they are moral and accountable? God is the Father of their spirits and the former of their bodies, and as the offspring of God they belong to him, and are accountable to him: they are as really his as the earth on which they dwell, and they have nothing of privilege, nor of talent, nor of means of happiness and usefulness, which has not come to them from God. And as God is the giver of all, so he is able to take away all their blessings, and they cannot live, nor breathe, nor move any longer than it is his pleasure that they should. Dependence, for aught that appears, may be contemplated as extending to all creatures, still in point of dependence they are all alike. No creature is beyond the reach of God's power; none is beneath his care. He is Creator of all, he is over all, holds the power of life and death in respect to all, and all are dependent on him for their continued existence. God challenges this supremacy to himself in his word: "I am God and there is no God with me. I kill and I make alive. I wound and I heal, neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand." Though dependence may be of the same nature in all creatures, so far as to place them in the hands of God, still it may be a question how far men are dependent on God. This leads

II. To inquire as to the extent of man's dependence on God. Under this inquiry I shall contemplate man just in respect to his powers of moral agency, and—secondly, in his character as a sinner.

Whenever doubt has arisen in the mind in regard to the extent of human dependence, it has respected man in the exercise of his powers of moral agency. It is admitted that these powers are from God, but in the exercise of them, it is said that man's freedom is such, as exempts him to a limited extent from dependence, and that God cannot controul man in

the exercise of his powers, as it would be his pleasure to. But what absurdity is there in admitting the idea of dependence in the soul of man on God? Can the human soul exist independently of God? Does not its immortality depend on the will of God?—and is not the soul dependent on God for its natural powers, and also in the exercise of those powers as well as for their continued and regular state? The understanding is the leading faculty of the soul, yet what man is there who can say that he is not dependent on God in the exercise of this faculty? or what man can say this faculty shall never be deranged? Who has not seen the mind thrown off its balance, and the understanding deranged and for the time being the person's moral agency impaired? Is not the Father of our spirits conversant with them? and does he not control all the influences and causes, which affect any of our faculties?—and shall we feel, that we are independent in the exercise of our powers? Saith the Psalmist, "O Lord thou understandest my thoughts afar off, for there is not a word on my tongue but O Lord thou knowest it altogether,—thou hast beset me behind and before and laid thine hand upon me! Whither shall I go from thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence?" I see no more absurdity in the entire dependence of man as a moral agent, than in the entire dependence of inanimate matter? And from man as a moral agent in the exercise of his faculties, I cannot detach the idea of dependence on God and yet retain him accountable to God! If man is capable of acting independently of God and beyond the power and influence of God to control and restrain him, I see not, why it does not follow, that he ceases to be accountable to God! Dependence and accountability in creatures who are moral agents, go hand in hand! Where dependence begins in a moral agent on God, accountability begins!—where dependence ends, accountability ends! On this principle, if men are supposed to act independently of God in the exercise of their powers of moral agency, we must suppose that they cease to be accountable to God in their conduct. But this conclusion is contrary to all that is taught us in the word of God on this subject. The law of God, the rule of duty to men as moral agents, requires obedience to God to the entire extent of their capacities, whether they choose to yield this obedience or not. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy strength

and with all thy mind and thy neighbor as thyself." This law extends the claims of God to man in the exercise of all his powers both as he stands related to God and to his fellow beings. The law takes for granted, therefore, man's dependence on God in the possession and use of his faculties, and it enforces his obligation of duty to God in the exercise of all his powers of moral agency. And this law is binding on every man—on all men in all their differences of condition and circumstances in the world! But how could this be supposed, if men are independent of God in the exercise of their powers of moral agency? how can the claims of God be enforced on creatures beyond the extent of their dependence? Free agency is supposed in the divine law—and the claims of God are enforced on men as dependent in their free agency on God, and of course as accountable to him to the full extent of their powers and in all their use of them. In accordance with this view of the dependence of men on God, are those declarations of the word of God in which God claims to himself the prerogative of searching and knowing their hearts; in which also he foretells their thoughts and conduct—and in which he asserts the prerogative of controlling their hearts and conduct. As dependent beings men cannot conceal what passes in their hearts from God. "The Lord seeth not as man seeth—the Lord looketh on the heart. If ye have forgotten the name of our God or stretched out our hands to a strange God, shall not God search this out, for he knoweth the secrets of the heart?" The righteous God trieth the heart and reins. The fining pot is for silver and the furnace for gold, but the Lord trieth the hearts." As God has cognizance of what passes in the hearts of men, so he knows before hand what their thoughts and actions will be:—and hence in many instances in his word, he has foretold how individuals would act,—and how nations would act, and the predictions have been fulfilled and he controls men in their hearts and conduct:—even the king's heart, "notwithstanding he has power over his fellow men, is declared to be in the hands of the Lord, as the rivers of water, as the streams of water, he turneth it whithersoever he will." The language of God concerning the proud king of Assyria, is—"I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria and the glory of his high looks! Shall the axe boast itself against him that heweth therewith?—or shall the saw magnify itself against him

that shaketh it?—as if the rod should shake itself against him, that lifteth it up, or as if the staff should lift itself up as if it were no wood?" What terms could express, more forcibly, entire and absolute dependence on God, and this too in reference to one of the proudest monarchs in ancient times? Need I multiply declarations from the Bible in proof of man's dependence on God as a moral and accountable creature?—when it is a truth so fully implied in all parts of the word of God—and when God holds man accountable for all his acts of moral agency, and has recorded his purpose to bring all men into judgment and to judge them as moral beings according to their deeds?

But 2d, I am to contemplate men, as sinners in their dependence on God.

As sinners they are dependent on God in another respect, than simply as creatures. Being rebellious in their tempers and lives—having become alienated from God in their affections and choice and conduct, they are in a state of condemnation and ruin, exposed to eternal death. And in this state of guilt and moral ruin, they are dependent on the mercy and compassion of God. The Gospel is a revelation of the grace of God for their salvation. As moral Governor, God was under no obligation to provide a Saviour or make known a way of salvation. The moral ruin and consequent dependence of the race of man on the mercy of God form the occasion for God to display his compassion in the gift of a Saviour—and in the provisions of grace through him. It is so represented in the divine word. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life, for God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." Thus mankind were dependent on the compassion of God for a Saviour and way of salvation. The Lord from heaven—the well beloved Son of God is such a Saviour as they need: he is in all respects suited to their necessities,—the terms of God's acceptance through him are adapted to their powers of moral agency and are in accordance with their obligations of duty, and so are all the motives by which their acceptance of these terms is urged, yet in their hearts as sinners men refuse these terms and slight the mercy freely offered to them in the Gospel, and they would all perish in their sins, were God to leave them to their own love and choice of sin. The

depravity of their hearts, manifest in their hatred of the Gospel, and rejection of the free salvation published to them, renders them still further dependent on God for salvation. This depravity in no respect excuses them in their rejection of the Gospel, it pertains to the affections or will in their souls and renders them dependent on the sovereign grace of God. Their obligations as moral agents remain in all their force; not impaired, nor weakened, nor removed by this sort of dependence on sovereign grace. It is their sin, their sin of nature and of practice, freely indulged and confirmed by habit, for which they are condemned by the Holy law of God, and for which they are without excuse, which God will accept. And this was pointed to by Christ when he said, "no man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." And in another connexion he taught the same moral impotency when he said to the unbelieving Jews, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." God has provided for the relief of sinners in this case in the gift of the Holy Spirit, and sinners are drawn to God by the effectual operation of the Holy Spirit on their heart; they are reconciled to God in this way. It is of grace to them according to God's own holy purpose. God is not under obligation to change the hearts of sinners, and yet every sinner is dependent on God for the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit, without which no sinner can come to him in repentance, and faith, and holy obedience. So deeply seated is sin in the hearts of men, so entire its dominion in the human will, that instead of at once embracing salvation freely offered to them, they turn away in aversion to it, and in order to their acceptance of the great salvation, God's compassion must extend to the taking away from them the stony heart and to the giving of an heart of flesh. Such is the dependence of men as sinners on the sovereign grace of God. God gives his spirit to subdue in the sinner the carnal mind; to cause the rebel to submit, the alienated heart to love him, and by the continued influence of his spirit and his truth to transform the regenerated sinner progressively into his own moral image, and thus to render him meet for Heaven. We find then in case of sinners on probation, as candidates for Heaven a dependence on the compassion and sovereign grace of God, which is peculiar to them as a class of moral beings, and which arises from their criminal, moral impotency: this dependence does not free them at all from

their obligation of duty as moral agents—their being sinners does not take away their obligation to be holy, nor God's right to require holiness of them. As creatures they are dependent on God for existence and for all their powers; as creatures they are dependent on him in the exercise of their powers and accountable to him in all their agency. They are sinners in his sight, and as sinners they are dependent on his compassion and sovereign grace for salvation.

Our dependence then renders it impossible that we should ever find real and permanent happiness in a state of hostility to God. All our sources of enjoyment are in his hands, our own existence is dependent on him: "In him we live and move and have our being." And to be at peace with him, approved in his sight, and conformed to his will are indispensable to our happiness as moral beings. We shall forever exist in our dependence on God, and unless we are reconciled to him and forgiven in Christ, it had been better for us if we had not been born. The unrenewed and the unpardoned are still in condemnation, and yet the way is open for their reconciliation and salvation. Remaining unreconciled to God, the sinner is out of Christ, standing in his own law-place, utterly unable to rescue himself from deserved death!

Men are prone to glory in themselves, in their powers of mind, in their wisdom or influence or usefulness. But all these and all other things, which are estimable in the human character, and in human attainments and pursuits, should lead us to glory in the Lord. To glory in ourselves, as if by our own wisdom, or power, or wealth, or skill, or attainments or usefulness, we had not constant occasion in our lives to feel and to acknowledge dependence, is to wrong God; it is taking to ourselves the glory which belongs to him. "Thus saith the Lord, let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might; let not the rich man glory in his riches, but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord, which exerciseth loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth."

Hence, we see the need of the special influences of the Holy Spirit. The influence of the Holy Spirit is not necessary to render men moral agents, nor to constitute them subjects of moral government. In regard to their powers of moral agency, saints and impenitent sinners are alike as to their dependence as creatures and accountability, and in the

outward enjoyment of religious privileges (which are of grace to all) they may be said to be subjects of grace in common. It is the dependence of men as sinners, which furnishes the occasion for special grace. The necessity for special grace is laid in their sinfulness. The Holy Spirit is the only effectual agent to the renewal of a sinner's heart. And whatever other truths are taught men by the preaching of the gospel, if this necessity for the Spirit's operation is lost sight of, men will have false views of their state as sinners and of the nature of saving conversion. The doctrine of the special influence of the Holy spirit coincides perfectly with our dependence as sinners, and in general so far as individuals fall into mistake concerning the latter, they err in their views of the former. Our dependence on the spirit of God for spiritual life and meetness for Heaven, arises from the sinfulness of our natures.

This subject teaches us to rejoice in the omnipotent and sovereign grace of God. As sinners, men had no claims on God for salvation, nor for any of the means and steps preparatory to their salvation. Their dependence as sinners left them all in the hands of God, absolutely at his option to treat them according to their desert of punishment, or to save them as an act of grace. God has revealed his purposes of grace in their behalf. We have reason to bless and praise his great and holy name, that he has been pleased so to do, and that the rebellion of the human will is not omnipotent; God is able to subdue it, and the omnipotence of his power is limited only by the purposes of his grace in its exercise. These purposes have their origin in the pleasure of his own will and are from eternity; and the reasons governing the ever blessed God in the application of them to individual sinners in the progress of the great work of redemption are concealed from finite comprehension in the hidden wisdom of God. In the dispensation of his spirit in connexion with the dispensation of his word, God acts as an holy sovereign. He gives his spirit to whom he will; "he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy." It is a gracious dispensation, in regard to the sovereignty of which, there is no just ground on the part of man to find fault with God! All are lost, all are ruined. God might have passed by fallen man as he did by fallen angels, and yet have been just and holy. As sinners mankind are absolutely dependent on his sovereign grace. Mercy is all their plea, while they have knowledge

that God is able to save them and that his power is commensurate with his wisdom and love! In these circumstances it becomes us to rejoice that God is omnipotent, and yet a gracious sovereign, and it becomes us to seek our help in him as the only rock of salvation! The language of his grace to ancient Israel is recorded for our instruction. "O Israel thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me is thy help."

ART. III.—REVIEW OF WAYLAND ON THE LIMITATIONS OF HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY, AND JAMES WOOD ON OLD AND NEW DIVINITY.

DR. WAYLAND in his brief treatise on the limitations of human responsibility travels over an extensive territory, and brings within our view the domains of ethics, civil and political jurisprudence, constitutional law, natural and revealed theology. His object however, is not to examine *the theory* of morals, but to teach practically. Referring to the principles of conscientious obligation, on page 10, he says,

"It is somewhat strange that they have not been more frequently discussed. To discuss them in a practical manner will be the design of the following pages. My only object will be to offer such suggestions as may enable a candid man to decide for himself, whether he in particular be under moral obligations to perform any particular act, or whether he is at liberty or under obligation to let it alone. If this can be done, many an honest mind will be relieved from frequent and distressing embarrassment."

The true science of the spiritual economy of humanity is indispensable to all useful reasonings and instructions upon this subject. "Principles, causes, and elements being unknown, the science whereof they are, is altogether unknown."* A discriminating examination of the principles and sanctions of the religion of nature and that of Christ; showing the "mega chasina," the great gulph that is *fixed* between them is much needed, from the prevalence of a popu-

* Fortesque.

lar, undistinguishing and plausible infidelity. A deplorable ignorance of the nature of good and evil is the cause of the distempers of our day. Man has a natural passion for independence of thought and action, and is sure to form false notions of obligation and freedom.

"Right is a pleasing thing, and liberty an old temptation." The rules of practical morality are generally known; but the true nature of their sanction is not understood. The *will of God* is insufficient for modern reason, and benevolence; and in its place, expedience, utility, and apparent good, are received as the rule and foundation of duty: and the dictates of *conscience* according to this standard impose the law of supreme obligation. Hence an ocean of responsibility submerges the ancient landmarks, and rolls its swelling and desolating tide over a boundless shore.

The moral elements are in a state of fearful disorder; "without form and void," there are earthquakes and tempests; distress and perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring. No voice but his who compasseth the waters with bounds and stilleth the tumult of the people, can say effectually *peace be still*. All human experiments are but the chains of Xerxes.

Though man sees the smoke, and the fire, and the desolating lava, he may not with his hand, cover the crater of *Ætna*, or the mouth of the bottomless pit. God is our only refuge and strength; a very present help in trouble: therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed; and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea: though the waves thereof roar, and be troubled: though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof. God is in the midst of his city, she shall not be moved.

The security and final triumph of the Church, is an unspeakable consolation, when reflection observes among the signs of the times, so much to excite the apprehensions of piety, and patriotism, for the stability of our religious and civil establishments.

It may not be denied, that our disease is exceeding great; there are indications in church and state, unequivocal of deep seated evil: and the prognosis is fearful, and baffles all human comprehension. Amid the wide spread and general disorders, none dream of their own infection. Every one points to *another* and cries *unclean*. All the patients are at large; none in the wards of a hospital. These are hypo-

thetical cases only ; and mere prescription is vain without the right, and power of caption and actual administration. And who shall arrest the majority ? Who can *funnel* the king ? Besides the diseased have the utmost confidence in the soundness and vigour of their own constitutions ; and abhor the doctor's nauseous poisons. They cannot be enticed with drugged confectionary ; much less will they submit to medicated steam, Thomsonian roots, scientific minerals, or the direful knife. The only hope, is to hold up the mirror of the word to God ; " peradventure He will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth."

That there is among the people, a lawless and terrible power, scorning all restraint, and threatening universal desolation, is evident to superficial observation. The irrepressible force within, that opposes all limitations of *conscience*, indicates its presence and its danger, by the hissing of vapour ; and occasional explosions in the moral and political world. The book on "moral limitations" opens here and there a safety valve ; or diverts the power, by conductors to put in motion machinery, whose action may be useful or harmless. It mistakes however the remedy. False principles lay at the foundation of the practical evils. "If the root be holy so are the branches." It is the continual supply of "wood, hay, and stubble," that keeps up the combustion ; this our author should have exposed, and called for water, and applied the extinguisher to the flames. Doubtless he would have been fumigated, blackened, and blistered, by recoiling volumes of smoke, ashes, and indignant steam ; but would he have realized, in some degree, his own idea of the "highest glory of human nature," in *suffering for the truth*.

We have no faith in temporising expedients ; or the most potent agencies of the pharmacopœia. Mortification has begun, and nothing will save but the instrument. There must be a separation of the clean and unclean, by that word which pierceth to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow.

There are too many Egyptians in the camp ; too many Babylonish garments and wedges of gold hid among the stuff in the tents of Israel : too many Babel-builders, with their slime and brick ; too many bewildered workmen, confounding the distinguishing signs of truth and error ; and confusing themselves and others by their words ; so that their speech cannot be understood by any ingenuity of ex-

egesis, or philosophy of explanation: too portentous a blending of the language of Ashdod and the Jews' language among the priests within the curtains of the tabernacle; too many altars being builded in the groves; too many sacrifices in the high places; and too much rejoicing and glorification in the devices and inventions of humanity. In fine, while the Church is on the verge of an universal apostacy from the gracious principles of the doctrine of Christ, a spirit of fanatic ferocity, and agrarian licentiousness, is assailing every thing that is venerable from age, approved by experience, or established in principle, among our civil and political institutions. A spirit that threatens to hide for ever, in the darkness and blood of Jacobinical midnight, the title deeds and the heirs of a well regulated liberty. The prophets preach, saying, the time cometh when one head shall not be lifted above another that shall not be cut off. This prevailing philosophy of the day is not only aggressive, but exterminating. The Pharisees of Paganism are going about (they say) "doing good," and every offence must be removed before the feet of these *benefactors*; (Luke, xxii 25, 26,) that the glorious results of their achievements may be made manifest to all men. Every thing in principle, or order, pertaining to learning, religion, morals, or civil jurisprudence that will not abide the test of a mere utilitarian scrutiny, is cast out as evil, and utterly denounced by an Atheistic philosophy. "*The greatest good of the greatest number*" is become the "queen of Heaven," and this Benthamite abstraction is the reigning deity of the day.

The communication between the heathen and the Israelites has been so protracted, unrestrained, and universal; with such a succession of intermarriages, social coalitions, and mutual accommodations, that the children are taught, and believe, that there is "*no difference*" between *thistle and wheat; cockle and barley; brick and stone; slime and mortar; a promise and a law; grace and justice; the curse and the blessing.*

Modern Pelagianism has broken down the walls, and demolished the bulwarks of Zion; and the levelling spirit of the age may be traced to the leaven of its demolishing infidelity. Man is born to achieve for himself a glorious destiny, an immortality of bliss. This is the cause and end of his existence; and every thing in heaven above, and earth beneath, is subordinated to its effectual consummation. His

religion is a problem; something for him *to do*; and that it is true and desirable so far forth as its tendency is perceived to promote his "chief end." The most momentous results for time and eternity depend upon, and await the direction of his reason and conduct. He has "*life in himself*;" and as he has to accomplish his own happiness, the essential element of his piety is *actio, actio, actio*, doing, doing, doing. His only obligation is *to do*. Religion is not of faith; but the man that *doeth* them shall live in them, Gal. iii. 12. In short, the admired religion of the land is rational, and Pagan. Instead of receiving a knowledge of good and evil from the testimony of Scripture, principles and conduct are subjected to the solitary test of practical utility, and determined according to their obvious effects, to be right or wrong.

Unsuccessful ambition is a traitor; but if she is arrayed in royal purple upon her throne, and makes an oration to the people, "*it is the voice of a God*." Cupidity in rags is a thief and a robber, and accommodated with a prison or a halter: but if she rides in her chariot, and directs her way to the city, the ocean, or the mountain stream; and chains her dependents to her ships, her drays, or her spindles; the laurel is upon her brow, and she is hailed a public benefactress. If murder stabs a Cæsar, the assassin is a Brutus, and an honourable man. If Christianity goes about clothing the naked, feeding the hungry, and healing the sick, relieving the wants of the body, and mitigating the evils of this life, "doing good," "*seen* and temporal," the people are gathered together unto her. But if she discourse of the life of the soul, of things spiritual, *unseen*, and eternal; if, like her Founder, when "*innumerable multitudes*" crowd about her, she warns them to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy, Luke xii. 1, Mark xvi. 12, many are offended. If she speak of the death that was accomplished at Jerusalem, they "*wag their heads*." If she witness, "*except ye eat the flesh, and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you*;" many account it a hard saying, John vi. 53, 60. If she testify "*no man can come unto me except it were given unto him of my Father*," many renounce her and her doctrine. John vi. 65, 66. If she say, "*I and my Father are one*," the Jews take up stones to stone her, John x. 30, 31. Principles, the tendency and effect of which are not seen to be good, or appear evil, overcome the faith of a mere "*cui bono*" man. He rejects the doctrine

as *useless*, or *hurtful* in its character. "He stumbles at the word."

Religion has degenerated in our free country, to a spiritual democracy. Contending systems of faith are submitted to the ordeal of the universal suffrage; and the infallible test of republican verity, the vote of the majority, decides their various pretensions. The sovereign people have assumed the spiritual supremacy, and reversed the maxim of Jesus, Matt. vii. 13, 14. They have decreed that "wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth unto life, and many there be that go in thereat." The multitude of witnesses is becoming the acknowledged seal of inspiration, and the voice of the people the oracle of God!

We propose hereafter to refer to the fundamental distinctions between mere natural theology and the religion of Jesus; and to show that much that is baptized into the name of Christianity is Gentile wisdom, mere heathenism, the spontaneous offspring of unrenewed and unsanctified humanity. In the mean time we will now proceed to introduce our readers to a general acquaintance with Dr. Wayland's Practical Views on Moral Limitations. This we shall do summarily in our own way, adding the Scripture sanctions which for the most part he has omitted to do.

The book is divided into nine sections. In the first, his subject is stated to be fanaticism, a perverted conscience, and its evil deeds. In the second and third sections, rules are furnished, whereby to determine the limits of personal responsibility, of which our readers will have a sufficient intimation from the following.

If a social evil exist, as for instance *loteries*, and a person has been no way accessory to their establishment, patronage or continuance, his conscience is clear of worshipping the blind goddess, 1 Thess. v. 22. A coachman's responsibility is in his carriage and horses only, and not for his employer's wife, or children, or farm, or bank account; and if these matters are upset, Mr. Whip has no cause to lay the lash to *his* conscience; he is not responsible, 1 Thess. iv. 11.

The obligation to a right state of mind, is affirmed to be universal; whether a responsibility attaches for a particular act or omission, will depend upon circumstances, John vii. 24, 1 Kings xv. 14, 2 Chron. xxv. 2. Sometimes the will is taken for the deed; when the "Spirit is willing but the flesh is weak." If a man have not the lamb let him bring

the doves, or the pigeons, or the fine flour. Lev. v. 7, 11, Matt. xxvi. 41. If beneficence have parted with her last mite, she may give poverty the palm of her hand, and say, be ye filled, &c. 2 Cor. viii. 12. If a Bishop preach the Gospel, he is not responsible for conversions, 1 Cor. iii. 7, nor a doctor of medicine for the success of his treatment. We think the author might here have pressed the responsibility of both ministers and physicians, to examine themselves well, their qualifications, science, and vocation. For it is no slight matter to convert the infirmity into a slaughter pen, or the flock of Jesus into food for wolves, Acts xx. 28—33, Matt. vii. 15. 2 Peter, ii. 1. "The life is more than meat, and the body than raiment," 2 Pet. 2.

Again, we are sometimes restrained in our actions by the rights of others. My neighbour's guinea I may not give to the poor, nor ought I to steal to *do good*, Rom. iii. 8. We are bound to promote temperance but not to tie the hands, or muzzle the mouth. Even a sot has personal rights. Nor may we impair another's good name under a pretence of good intentions; nor oblige a friend from benevolent considerations, a former promise forbidding. I may not lend my brother the ingots, whatever are his necessities, if I have promised them to a stranger; nor may we pervert a specific grant of power, to a purpose for which it was not delegated, however desirable may be its exercise. Nor may persuasion, or reason offer deceptive motives or arguments, or beneficence false coin, to effect the best thing, Rom. iii. 8. Again, sometimes one duty may be omitted, or postponed, to perform one of a more pressing emergency. Thus, if Victoria and her horse are both in the ditch, I may first extend a helping hand to the queen. Thus much for the second and third sections. The writer does not profess to have exhausted the subject of moral limitations, and counteracting obligations; but merely to have shown there were such things, "in rerum natura:" and in conclusion, on page 47, he truly says, "The points insisted on in the preceding pages, are nearly all comprehended within the limits of the question, whether or not the ends justify the means?" Being in fact, nothing more than the renewal of old Jesuitical casuistry; the revival and prevalence of which is the result of the Popish theology, which has become so popular; as we intend to show if we have time and opportunity.

Persecution on account of religious opinion, is the topic

of the fourth section; and the right to do more in the premises than use the power of argument and testimony, is very properly denied. But there are opinions in this section we cannot endorse, and may have occasion to notice hereafter. The fifth section treats of the propagation of truth, and the general duty of publishing all useful knowledge and discoveries, but under the following limitations. The truth is not to be told at all times; a decent regard is to be had to the peace of society, the rules of decorum, and the law of faith. We are not to be tattlers, and busy-bodies in other men's matters, 1 Tim. v. 13. In conversation, if my hearer wishes to depart, "let him depart." I have no right to hold him by the button-hole; nor, if stronger than he, to force his ears into my service. The disciples of Jesus are not to cast pearls before swine, Matt. vii. 6, nor always answer a fool according to his folly, Prov. xxvi. 4. In a town meeting, a man has no right to introduce antimasonry, religion, or abolitionism; Morgan, Paul, or Garrison; for these are the men, that have turned the world upside down; and "there is a time for all things," Eccl. iii. 1. Tom Paine has the same right to put the "Rights of Man" into the reverend author's pocket, as he has to put the "Gospel Witness" into Paine's. Again, I may induce my neighbour to to give his money for a public charity, by a candid statement of facts; and should then leave him if he gives, to be a "cheerful giver," 2 Cor. ix. 7. But I have no right by good words, and fair speech, to deceive the hearts of the simple, Rom. xvi. 18; nor to apply the forcing pump and suction hose of a mendicant Friar.

Again, in teaching the doctrine of Scripture, we should not confound our inductions, or opinions with the written testimony. These will give the reader an idea of the rules in this section.

The sixth section is upon *voluntary societies*. The author does not, with a full cry, swell the encore of glorification. All these signs and mighty wonders may be true, and they may not. Some he thinks are good things; and very properly makes a distinction between the societies, purely benevolent; and the agitating combinations. The one, aim only at "doing good;" the other at changing public sentiment, with a view to ulterior action and reform.

The writer, is perhaps mistaken in putting the only, or the main difference of individual and associated action in the

pledge ; for though one thousand men remain the same in number, as he says, yet drill and tactics do wonders. A trained band can master superior numbers who are a confused multitude ; there is also the " *esprit des corps*," and the necessary officers of the organization must be ordinarily paid ; and hence the powerful argument of preferment. History tells that the Pope's supremacy prevailed over that of the councils, because his holiness had the making of bishops, archbishops, and cardinals, while the councils plead " *in forma pauperis*." A distinguished statesman has truly remarked, " The world has been governed by constructive, not real majorities. The great mass of mankind have done nothing but sanction, by a tacit acquiescence, what has been done by a few bold, and active spirits, without consulting their opinions. The Jacobins who ruled France so despotically, were always in a miserable minority, even in the convention, as the ninth Thermidor revealed ; they might at any time have been put down, had the majority understood each other, or had there been any means of ascertaining the real state of public opinion in France, sickened as she was, at the atrocities under which she was bleeding, without hope."* " From instances of popular tumults, seditions, factions, panics, and of all passions which are shared with a multitude, we may learn the influence of *society* in exciting and supporting any emotion ; while the most ungovernable disorders are raised, we find by that means, from the slightest and most frivolous occasions. He must be more or less than man, who kindles not in the common blaze."†

Dr. Wayland exposes some of the evils of voluntary societies, as a depressing the sense of personal responsibility, by throwing it on a corporation, which has no soul : the compounding of duties, for money grants ; the privation of private intercourse with the house of mourning ; and a desertion of the fatherless, and widow, to the visits of official responsibility ; and finally the temptations to political coalitions. The abuse of the voluntary principle is instanced in the Trades Union, the French Jacobins ; and as our societies may be perverted, they require watching. To keep them in check, and within lawful limits, he proposes, that the object be always avowed, explicit, and innocent, both as to matter and manner of action ; and should mea-

* H. S. Legare.

† Hume inquiry on Principles of Morals, Sec. iv.

tures involving principle, policy, or testimony, be at any time adopted that a member disapproves, he should withdraw his name.

The seventh section is on ecclesiastical associations; the eighth on official responsibility. These we propose to notice hereafter. The ninth and last section is on the slavery question.

Most of the counsel in the book, is founded on a knowledge of good manners, and in common sense. We find little to censure in its ethical precepts; but these are all powerless without that wisdom, and that sanction which cometh from above.

The mere moralist, politician, or utilitarian, may devise ways and means to counteract the baneful influence of evil, by antagonist checks, or to change it by diverting it into channels of public utility; but the Christian casuist should strike at the root of the evil itself, by appealing to those principles, and that power, which are sufficient for its destruction, 1 John iii. 8.

The reader will have perceived the general object and drift of the author; he treats practically; his principles for the most part he assumes; some of which appear to us obscure, others defective; and again, there are those that seem to recognize doctrines which we consider subversive of the true foundations of Christian and social obligation. We do not know that we understand him. A want of exactness has produced some ambiguity and confusion; and therefore, when we comment we shall give our readers the text. We cannot however acquit the author of this book from all blame in the premises. His disease was exceeding great, yet he sought not to the Lord, but to the physicians, 2 Chron. xvi. 12. A workman that needeth not be ashamed, at this time should lay a good foundation; *he is bound to do it*; and not leave it to a peradventure, whether the whole moral fabric rests upon the eternal grace and truth of Christ, or upon mere utilitarian, and Pelagian philosophy.

"Principiis obsta: sera medicina paratur
Cum mala per longas invaluere moras."

No one touches the chord that makes the heart of the believer vibrate with spiritual sensibility, save when he puts his hand upon the word of God. Unless we have a Bible view of the spiritual economy of humanity, we look at all

its phenomena through false media, and premises; and we are sorry to say, that an examination of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, is in our day, by no means superfluous.

That mankind are by the providence of God, in an homogeneous moral condition; that the very spiritual basis, and essential character of every human being, is by nature the same, is a principle at the foundation of universal jurisprudence, and is fundamental in all legislation, human and divine, without which there could be no general system of moral administration. What this state is, becomes a topic of the most affecting import, and has been the great subject of supreme interest, study, and contention among the different schools, and sects of philosophy and religion since the world began. For upon this depends the "*To Kalon*." This determines the grand point, as to what is necessary for the perfection of humanity, self-indulgence, self-denial, an ameliorating and restorative discipline, or a **RESURRECTION**. The last, Christianity alone teaches, and effects: some one of the former, every system of Anti-christ assumes. It will be seen from what has been said, that the very nature of right, liberty, and obligation, cannot be understood without going to the foundations of religion, and of the institutions of civil society.

Passing over remote antiquity for the present, we will glance at the history of moral sentiment in Modern Europe. Grotius who is regarded as the father of International law, flourished in the early part of the seventeenth century. He explored and illustrated with amazing industry, research, and learning, and his disciples and commentators Paffendorff, Barbeyrac and others, established the principles of National jurisprudence; and modern Christian nations appear in some degree, to acknowledge their deductions as guides in their sovereign correspondence. In establishing the principles of universal or natural law, the Doctors profess to make their inductions from the resources of reason only. The improvements in this science however, have not been by the discoveries of the learned, but finding the true principles in the Christian system, they have proved their truth and utility by argument, and thus they become a part of the International code, on the *authority* of this *demonstration*. We are however, concerned with the researches of these philosophers no farther than they relate to natural

theology and ethics, with their views of the obligation and sanction of the moral law.

That Christian nations have not recognized the Bible as having supreme obligation and authority in the *Lex Gentium*, results from a jealousy of an independent spiritual dominion, and fears for their sovereign establishments. True sovereignty acknowledges no equal, much less a superior; legislative, judicial, or executive. The Sovereign makes, interprets, and executes law, and his fundamental maxim is *the good of the state*; if that can be promoted in the judgment of kings, by the Scriptures, they call them to their aid; but they rather choose to use the word of God as a servant than a master.

Notwithstanding characteristic differences, the learned doctors on Natural Religion and Universal Jurisprudence, coalesce in the doctrines which lay at the foundation of every human system. We extract these principles from Burlamaqui's *Institutes of Natural and Political Law*. This book is esteemed a judicious commentary upon preceeding authors; rather than an original production; but it is a work of admired and high authority. We proceed to state the three first principles of Natural Religion and Law.

I. *That the human understanding is naturally right, and has within itself, a strength sufficient to arrive at the knowledge of the truth, and to distinguish it from error; especially in matters of virtue, honor and peace.* To question this principle is to sap the foundations, to subvert the whole structure of society, and to nullify the distinction between right and wrong; good and evil: Burlamaqui, part I. ch. 1. sec. 7. Whatever strength may be attributed to the inclinations passions and habits, they have never enough to impel man, invincibly, to act contrary to reason. That reason has it always in her power to preserve her superiority and her rights; and is able, with care and application, to correct vicious dispositions, to bridle unruly passions, and by sage precautions, to weaken and finally destroy them. Burl. part I. ch. 2. sec. 16. Obstacles are to be surmounted, but victory will be a glorious trophy to virtue. Thus the dictates of conscience, right or wrong, instructed by reason, is the supreme rule of obligation. Burl. part II, ch. 1, sec. 2; Part II, ch. 9; ch. 7; ch. 5, sec. 5; chap. 4, sec. 9, 10; ch. 3, sec. 9, ch. 2, sec. 6, 8.

II. *That the chief end of man is his own happiness.* Such

is man's constitution and nature that self-love, (which has nothing vicious in it) is the main spring of all his motions, tastes and choices; the "*primum mobile*" of all his determinations. Thus God has made man, and thus he necessarily is; and he cannot change this bent of his will; this *natural instinct*. This proposition is a truth of the very last importance; the key as it were to the human system; the very ground sill of Natural Theology. Burl. part I. ch. 5, sec. 4, 5, 6, 7.

III. *That good and evil are determined by their relation to man's happiness.* Good is whatever is agreeable to man; for his preservation, entertainment, pleasure and perfection; and evil is the opposite of good. Burl. part I. ch. 5, sec. 8.

This is the triangle of humanity. Some or all of its sides support every human system. If any thing is wrong in man he possesses the power of self-restoration. He has the elements of perfectibility, and his only enquiry is for the rules of right action for the consummation of his life. This is distinctive of natural religion; which never asks for the "*power of godliness.*" 2 Tim. 3, 5, but for the *work to be done*. Reason, self-love or sentiment is the spring of all her actions—*Christ never*.

That man ought to *do*, to accomplish the most desirable destiny, or in what consists the essence of virtue, is the great desideratum, the philosopher's stone in this department of enquiry. Dr. Adam Smith says, there were three theories among the ancient Heathen Philosophers.

I. That virtue consists not in affection specifically, but in the proper government and direction of our affections. This makes virtue to consist in *propriety*.

II. That virtue consists in the judicious pursuit of our own happiness, or in the proper government and direction of those selfish affections which aim solely at this end. This makes virtue to consist in *prudence*.

III. That virtue consists in those affections only which aim at the happiness of others; not in those which aim at our own. This makes virtue to consist in *disinterested benevolence*. The first he says includes Plato, Aristotle and Zeno. The second Epicurus and his disciples. It is also the Seminal tenet of Taylorism. The third, the Eclectics and later Platonists and we may add it was the distinguishing dogma of the old Saducees. Some of the ancient philosophers *boasted* that their virtue was superior to that of the

gods; for *these* were good by nature; whereas the goodness of wise men was the achievement of their own exertions, self-denial and philosophy. Our modern Peripatetics walk in the porch of these Solomons.

We will here add a few testimonies to the foregoing principles:

"Though reason, when fully assisted and improved, be sufficient to instruct us in the pernicious or useful tendency of qualities and actions, it is not alone sufficient to produce any moral blame, or approbation. Ability is only a tendency to a certain end, and were the end totally indifferent to us, we should feel the same indifference, towards the means. It is requisite a sentiment should here display itself, in order to give a preference to the useful, above the pernicious tendencies. This sentiment can be no other than a feeling for the happiness of mankind; and a resentment of their misery: since these are the different ends which virtue and vice have a tendency to promote. Here, therefore, reason instructs us, in the several tendencies of actions, and humanity makes a distinction in favor of those which are useful and beneficial." Hume.

Dr. Adam Smith remarks, "Upon whatever we may suppose our moral faculties are founded, whether upon a certain modification of reason, upon an original instinct, called a moral sense, or upon some other principle of our nature; it cannot be doubted they were given us for our conduct in life. They carry along with them then, the most evident badges of this authority, which denote that they were set up within us, to be the supreme arbiters of all our actions; to superintend all our senses, passions and appetites; and to judge how far each of them was to be indulged or restrained. Since these, therefore, were intended to be the governing principles of human nature; the rules which they prescribe, are to be regarded as the commands and law of the Deity; promulgated by these viceregerents; which he has set up within us." *Moral Sentiments*, pp. 138, 136, 137. Again, "In the beneficial or hurtful nature of the effects which the intention or affection aims at, or tends to produce, consists the merit or demerit of the action." See pages 10, 53, 64, 77, 81, 137. The philosophy of Dr. Paley is of the same Pagan original. "There are no moral maxims, which do not bend to circumstances." Civil allegiance and duty "to God, is founded on expedience in the long run." See more

to the same purpose. Moral Phil. p. 31, 52, 55, 58, 62, 84, 92, et alitu.

Some moral writers have taught that there would be no obligation to obey a divine precept, unless it were ultimately founded on the happiness of the subject, and that this is the true ground of obligation. Hence, no one can err who conforms to those principles which he sincerely believes to be for his own interest, *and on that account*. These and similar theories abolish all distinction in principle between right and wrong.

Modern metaphysicians build their fine and frail structures upon the triangle of humanity. Dr. Reid and his disciples are expressly upon this base, and modern Pelagianism reposes on Dr. Reid and his disciples. The wise, unwilling that the earth should "*hang upon nothing*," have traced its fundamental dependence to a *turtle*; but the substructure of this animal, has heretofore been regarded as a philosophic puzzle.

Utility is the origin and test of all justice and law, says Jeremy Bentham, and so say the philosophers of Paganism, ancient and modern; the learned Doctors of the "*Jus Gentium*," and also Skidmore, Fanny Wright, Robert Dale Owen, et id omne genus. *Utility is the principle*; if they differ, it is in the "*adaptation*" of means and measures: in adjusting the beam of "*passionate and rational estimates*" in the "*quo modo merely*." They agree about the scales, and dispute only about the weights.

Let us now briefly notice the history of the principles of the triangle of humanity; and first, as developed by man in his social condition.

A tribe or state, is a moral as well as political entity; but partaking more of the power and independence of sovereignty, and being under less external restraint than a natural person, its conduct intimates more unequivocally, the native tendency of predominating sentiment.

Moral Heathen, civilized or barbarous, are under the influence of those principles of natural religion, which are substantially embraced in the triangle of humanity. "The good of the state" is the universal maxim. Good policy determines good morals. Its own glory and welfare are the avowed doctrinal and practical axioms of sovereignty; and its action depends upon the temporary conviction of the tendency of measures, to promote the public interest. The

notion of utility for the time being, the reigning philosophy of the day, is the secret power that sets the whole state in motion.

Savages believe the public welfare is consulted in the unbridled indulgence of their passions, especially in successful depredations upon their neighbours, and the acquisition of spoils. Ministration to lust, is the "To Kalon," and goods, and persons, the game of these Nimrods. War is the natural state, because it supposes a universal license for disorder, piracy, licentiousness, and violence. These principles are not confined to hordes of men wild, and unsettled, but apply also to the most refined states of antiquity. The Roman Empire was founded on the principle of plunder from first to last. A wild and murderous barbarism, regarded a stranger and an enemy as identical, and habitually seized as lawful prize, not only every description of property, but doomed the persons of these captives to perpetual slavery or death. During the most licentious times, the maxim "that nothing which was *useful* was *unjust*" was the reigning and detestable principle of international law.

The prevalence of chivalry, and the ecclesiastic consolidation of Europe by the Roman hierarchy tended respectively to modify and mitigate the ferocity of the times, to inculcate some notions of natural equity, and paved the way for the introduction of the sentiments of conscience and honour in the correspondence and intercourse of nations. But notwithstanding these, and the establishment of the Christian religion in the Eastern and Western Empires, it was not till the time of Grotius, that new principles of public welfare, and a more benign philosophy, began to engage the minds of statesmen and princes, and to introduce more just sentiments of the natural rights of mankind.

Sovereigns and subjects, whatever they formally conceded as binding on private conscience, and as personal duty, have waited for the demonstrations of reason, and the results of experience, as to the *effect*, the *utility* of principles, before they were admitted even theoretically into the natural code. Philosophers knew their only hope of success was by this probation. The prerogatives of majesty receive no laws, even from the Scripture on their intrinsic authority.

A new epoch however dawns, and the public good is believed to be involved in some measure with the observance of the laws of universal justice. The state begins

to be regarded in some degree a moral being, and bound to act worthy of her nature, "natural *convenienter vivere*."—*Vattel*.

But notwithstanding the views of practical policy change, the radical basis of supreme obligation is the "good of the state." There is a change in conduct, but none in principle. A besotted ignorance, madness or ambition, believed the public good consisted in the acquisition of territory, dominion or glory, or in the propagation of religion, and this is prosecuted with all the power of the state, according as these respective sentiments predominate, and we see, generation after generation, the miserable victims of a universal wretchedness and carnage, fighting through crusades of darkness and blood to achieve some sentimental abstraction! the reigning queen of Heaven, sincerely and religiously believing themselves martyrs in the cause of "doing good."

Again, "the balance of power" becomes the "Zelos" of the courts of Europe and coalitions among the minor dominions is necessary to humble some *mighty one*, and kill down her people to the general average, and the public good of each state can be promoted in no way but by destroying the prosperity of every one as she rises in the scale of nations.

Next commerce and manufactures are the all absorbing topics of public interest; the end of the social compact, and every thing is subordinated to their prosperity, and states become embroiled in perpetual wars by these clamorous handmaids to cupidity. Most of the wars of Great Britain, for more than a century have been commercial. The same is true of many in Europe. Bonaparte's continental war was against the commerce and manufactures of England.

The internal policy of nations has corresponded in principle with their foreign. All the institutions of municipal law, and civil jurisprudence, aim only at the attainment of the public welfare;* and how this is to be promoted is the great problem of the statesman. The investigations of political economy, have produced entirely new views in the theory of legislation with regard to the following among

* We are tracing these principles in connexion with *actual sovereignty*; whether that resided in a single monarch, or was tempered by some more popular modification of government; whether one man was "the state," or many. The sovereign power always seeks its own; the good of the state, is the good of the sovereign whoever or whatever that is.

other important topics: restrictions, monopolies, imposts, corporations, balance of trade, banks, Tariffs, currency; in the perpetual warfare of labour against capital, and capital against labour, and labour against labour; and on the important subject of public education, and the police of the poor. Dr. Matthus has attempted to prove, that all public institutions for the provisions of the poor, and all taxes and contributions for their support, are a real injury to the state, and tend only to the increase of poverty, wretchedness and vice, and "would afford more effectual relief to the poor if saved, accumulated and expended in the form of capital, which would furnish *employment*, instead of fostering thoughtlessness, idleness, imposition and dissipation." We are not considering whether this, or the other new views of public good and general welfare, introduced by theorists on these subjects are true, but whether the righteousness of measures or principles, are to abide the simple test of their apparent utility; whether virtue itself changes with the reigning opinions of the day; whether there be in reality, an essential difference in principle between the peaceful benevolent, and philosophic dreams of the Atheist, Jeremy Bentham, and the warlike principles and heroic spirit of the great Tamerlane; whether there is more true charity and righteousness, in the economical overture of Satan to our Saviour, to turn the stones into bread, than in the proposition to precipitate himself from the pinnacle of the temple.

We see that civil sovereignty has heretofore sought its happiness in doing good; embracing fully the principles at the triangular base of the human system, every tribe, state and empire has sought its own welfare, by fraud or violence; sometimes by the arts of diplomacy, or unfriendly legislation; but for the most part by wars.

The speculations of philosophers have at length, however entered the cabinet, and statesmen and princes, animated by the same *principles* of the human triangle, are about to adopt a new *policy*. They have been convinced that the good of the state will prosper best, if they cease from some of their labors and *rest*; that when they *do least*, they *do best*; and that wars for plunder, glory, religion or commerce are *not* for the public welfare. That the happiness of one nation, is best promoted by a free, friendly and commercial correspondence with others; and that the prosperity of all will most conduce to the happiness of each. In addition to

these enlightened views of international policy ; great changes of opinion in the empire of internal or municipal law, have occurred in our day. The topics of modern improvement have been noticed, and the *principle* which the inductions, demonstrations and illustrations of science, from history, and facts has established, is, that in most of these respects the *less* the government *do*, the *better* they *do*.

Dr. Vethake, referring to the police of the poor, and the mischief that has been done to them, by the most generous institutions and best intentions in their behalf, says : " It is a disregard or forgetfulness of the true principles, that pauperism has been so often multiplied by the very means which were destined to eradicate it : thus furnishing one of the most remarkable instances of the injury which benevolence, unenlightened by knowledge, is capable of inflicting."*

The two maxims, " *Laisses nous faire*," (let us alone,) being the answer of the French merchants to the government when asked what it could *do* for commerce ; and " *pas trop gouvernor*" (do not overgovern) are the new discovered optics of political intelligence.

That the writers on the economy of government, are in fact, commentators upon natural religion, will be perceived from the following remarks of Professor Vethake, viewed in connection with the triangle of the human system. Having called *that* **USEFUL**, which supplies actual wants or desires, he defines *wealth* to comprehend all objects having **UTILITY** that can be appropriated ; thereby excluding only nature's stintless gifts, as the light and heat of the sun, air, water, &c., he proceeds to state the province of political economy to be " to determine the laws which regulate the production, distribution and consumption of wealth ; with the practical object in view of ascertaining the course to be pursued or avoided, by individuals and by governments, in the disposal of the wealth under their control, so as to promote, in as great a degree as possible, the happiness of mankind."†

A system that determines the categories of good and evil by their effect on the state, reposes on the cardinal tenet of Mr. Hobbes, the object of whose theory was to subject *conscience* wholly to the trial of the civil forum, and to demolish every spiritual tribunal and ghostly jurisdiction.

Of the origin and foundation of natural jurisprudence,

*Political Economy, p. 356.

†Do. p. 16.

Grotius says, "When several persons in various times and places, maintain the same thing as certain, this ought to be referred to a general cause. Now in questions of this kind, the cause can only be attributed to one or the other of these two; either a just consequence, drawn from natural principles; or an universal consent. The first discovers to us the law of nature, and the other the law of nations."* To demonstrate a general correspondence of sentiment in the great rules of duty, and the fundamental principles of morals among mankind, was his object; and his testimonies are eviscerated with vast labor and learning from the writings of historians, poets, orators, philosophers and divines. That there is a foundation for such a uniformity laid in *nature*, that mankind do possess a homogeneous moral constitution; is a truth at the bottom of all enquiry on these topics: it is this that subjects the moral phenomena of men and states to elementary analysis, and forms the basis of all general inductions. Hence "there is nothing new under the sun." The boasted "*utility*" is no new creature, though in a fashionable dress. The *principle* is as old as the lapse of man: in fact older, for we find it constituting a large ingredient in the fatal poison of serpentine subtlety. "Ye shall not surely die; your eyes shall be opened and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."† Kent ‡testifies that the saying of Euphemius in Thucydides that "*nothing which was useful was unjust*," was in every one's mouth in the days of Grotius. "*The greatest good of the greatest number*" is only the democratic *exposition* of the old doctrine.

Universal history establishes the fact that wherever the supreme dominion is, there is *the state*, *the king*, and that public welfare and the interest of actual sovereignty are convertible terms. In a despotism, by taxation and conscription; all the property and all the persons are subject to the will of "*the unit*;" and utility to *him* is the criterion to determine all public policy, foreign and domestic. If the sovereignty is *de facto*, by the operation of a system, in *the people*, whatever the theory of government may be, "*the greatest good of the greatest number*" will become in practice the predominating maxim. Again it pertains to sovereignty not only to demand its own happiness, but also to

*De jure Belli et Pacis Preliminary Discourse.

†Gen. 3:4, 5. ‡Cour. vol. I. 16.

determine *for itself* wherein that does consist. This is a problem for *majesty*. For a citizen under any government to determine this for his own rule, would be to become a self-constituted oracle of an "*arcanum imperii*." It pertains to the prerogative of royalty, to determine what is for the public good. This is declared plainly by the law, or the office is delegated to some subordinate function, a judicial or ministerial magistracy, to which it pertains to declare, to expound or to execute.

Should any theorist believe that the supreme authority had mistaken the general welfare, and that he understands the subject much better, he will nevertheless, if a good citizen, submit to the public policy; but if he be enthusiastic and *very* conscientious, he may prove refractory, and with the fixed determination to serve the state, in the best possible way, scorn the public authority and trample the laws under foot. However sincere this man's purposes to "do good," no earthly sovereign would tolerate with impunity, such contempt and rebellion: although as human legislators and judges are not infallible, the contumacious citizen may possibly be right in his speculations. It is indispensable to the very existence of all sovereign power, that it always possess the full dominion over the legislative, judicial and executive departments; for *the law* would not remain did not the authorized *interpretation* bind; and it would become a dead letter did not the sovereign execute his *own interpretation*. The question therefore of duty, in respect to the state for the time being, is not abstract; what is best for the public? but what is the law? how is it written? The opinion of the state expressed by its constituted organs is the rule. The "*ultima ratio*," for law in every form of supreme dominion is the *will of the sovereign*. "*Ita lex scripta est*."

Human laws necessarily vary, as the legislature changes its policy; for the law being based on utility, when experience teaches a new lesson by practical results or theory promises better things; the law is changed for "*cessat ratione cessat et ipsa lex*." As a code of morals then, the system of the human triangle, must result in a temporising expediency; a Jesuitical sophistry and compromise; or a universal Pyrrhonism. No one, therefore, while pecking here, will quarry the *true rock*. Before we take leave of this part of our subject, and of the political economists, we would remark, that the substratum of all their philosophy

(which is sound) is from the Bible, and that the three following principles are at the basis of the true science of government.

I *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.**

II. *In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread.† Six days shalt thou labor.‡ If any will not work neither should he eat.§*

III. *The supreme power is the minister of God in the state; a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.||*

The civil power is the ordinance of God to maintain justice, not to do good; to defend and protect the peaceable subject in his person and property from fraud and violence, from foes within and foes without, peaceably if possible, forcibly if necessary; and to *this end* the power of the sword is given. The great pervading principle of the divine government with respect to the *doings* of mankind is *thou shalt not do*.

The political economist will perceive that the above canons of scripture, if obeyed, would realize his dreams and the golden age of fable.

The first would establish universal peace, the second unmitigated prosperity and happiness, and the third all improper "tampering" of government in "other men's matters."

We will next proceed to notice the operations of these triangular principles upon the church, and then upon individuals.

(To be Continued.)

ART. IV.—CHARACTER OF THE LATE REV. ALVAN HYDE, D. D., OF LEE, MASS.

By the REV. CYRUS YALE, of New-Hartford, Con.

FIVE years have now passed away, since the death of the lamented Dr. Hyde. His exit, sorrowful as sudden, received at the time very suitable and extensive notice. A memoir of his life soon appeared from the Boston press. This met the hearty welcome of the Christian community, as a choice addition to its religious biography. Many a

*Math. 19 : 19.

†Gen. 3 : 19.

‡Exod. 20 : 9.

§2 Thes. 3 : 10.

||Rom. 13 : 1—8. Tit. 3 : 1. 1 Pet. 2 : 13—25.

delighted reader has found himself breathing a holy and healthful atmosphere throughout the volume. At this late hour, to pronounce the memoir a *good* likeness, would be only to echo the united voice of not a few competent judges. The portrait was, in truth, chiefly formed of sketchings from Dr. Hyde's own pencil, while the friendly hand that arranged the whole, and now and then gave a judicious touch, very happily concealed itself behind the features it would help portray.

Not a *portrait*, but a *miniature* of the lovely man is the humbler aim of this article. Our position, at this distance of time, has possibly a balance of advantage for presenting the stronger points of a character, around which the memory of friendship loves to linger. If the view, at this mellowing distance, lose somewhat in vividness, and in strength of emotion, it may gain more in sober correctness. So long a delay might indeed be fatal to one of different cast, and less solid worth. But the elements of Dr. Hyde's character are not ephemeral. So rare a combination of excellences will bear severest scrutiny. And the longer we view them, the deeper will be our sense of their value. Such constellations of virtue "fear not time." They appear best, apart from adventitious circumstances, alone, in the circle of their own glory.

Dr. Hyde was not one of those moral meteors—alas their frequency of late!—whose coruscations, fitful and portentuous, dazzle, and delight and astonish the gaping multitude for a moment, and then give place to their own legitimate progeny of still newer forms and movements, if not higher pretensions. More like the *sun*; he rose bright in life's fair morning, and steadily ascended to the high meridian, and there hung long in mid-heaven, without loss of splendor—casting forth his benign beams over a broad circle:—till, on a sudden, thousands felt a strong chill—they eagerly raised their eyes—the luminary was gone—God had taken him up to higher sphere, and the burst of grief was universal. And the sad news called forth from many a bleeding heart the spontaneous effusion; "My Father, my Father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof!"

In his character, we find no features of marked greatness, in the popular sense—no eccentricity or peculiarity, of any sort. His very uncommon usefulness, and his high standing in the church, seemed to result more from a happy combination of many good qualities common to man, than

from one or a few strong features of rare occurrence ; more from a wise and uniform course of untiring action in his Master's service, in all the relations of life, than from a few gigantic efforts and splendid performances. Neither the daily observers of his life, nor strangers, as they turned from him, were accustomed to exclaim : " What strength of intellect ! what power of imagination ! what a wonderful man ! "

One prominent characteristic was stern integrity. Straight forward in his course, and chiefly desirous to perform his duty, fearless of consequences, he made use of no pitiful trick to carry a favorite point—none of that double-dealing wisdom of this world, or adroitness, too fashionable, alas ! in some clerical circles, by which a bad or a doubtful cause is sometimes sustained.

Decision was another feature of his character: not the loud and violent rashness—not the blind and inflexible obstinacy which sometimes assumes the name of decision ; but a firmness based on broad views, cautiously taken—on intelligent and Christian principle—on the settled convictions of conscience. Hence, " in troublous times," he was firm as the mountains round about his dwelling. If, at any time, he might seem to a stranger somewhat positive, a further acquaintance would show this appearance to have been the positiveness of principle, the sternness of well-considered argument, the inflexibility of an enlightened and tender conscience.

Honest frankness was also a striking feature of the character before us. In all important matters in which Providence required him to act, his was an open stand. No one could doubt his real sentiments. He made no effort to sail under false colors. He ever seemed to act under the full belief, that the truths he preached were from heaven, and neither required nor admitted any disguise in their presentation to men. He was therefore as bold and as fearless in their announcement, as he was skillful and firm in their defence—never betraying, by a tremulous hesitancy, a secret doubt of their correctness. It is presumed he was never suspected of a time-serving policy. He made no attempt to render error palatable, by mixing it with truth ; nor did he dexterously cover up unwelcome truth with flowers of rhetoric, or with words ambiguous and dark as a Delphic oracle. " An Israelite indeed, in whom was no guile," he always spake as

under the pressure of a message from God, and as mainly solicitous to deliver it clearly and fully.

To the preceding traits may be added strong common sense. This, in a very happy combination of good qualities, contributed not a little to that extensive influence for which Dr. Hyde was so distinguished. Other men have had equal, perhaps greater influence in particular spheres, but, without hyperbole, the writer never knew the influence of a single person so universally powerful as in this case. It seemed almost illimitable, in all situations, and amid all ranks and ages and grades of culture, from the private interview with some obscure individual, up to the ecclesiastical council and the state convention. No man more uniformly carried his point, and yet always so fairly, and so meekly, and with such force of argument and simplicity of illustration, that every one saw it to be fairly done, and yielded to his views with cheerfulness at the time, and with satisfaction afterward. His was entirely the reverse of that course in which one may with equal certainty carry his point, by so encircling an opponent that he can but yield, yet with present reluctance, and subsequent sorrow, if not anger. In the former case, a person yields intelligently, cheerfully, and even eagerly, in view of strong light and motive; in the latter, he feels cramped and constrained to a compliance, by a sort of Jesuitical management, but with present reluctance and future displeasure: a sting is left behind. Dr. Hyde, like the Master he loved to imitate, dealt much in familiar parable. He spoke with a gravity, almost authority of manner at times, the result of a full conviction, joined to an ardent love of truth. The absence of all artifice was alike visible in his face, and audible in the tones of his voice. If he had the wisdom of the serpent, it was always modified and sanctified, and made doubly efficient with friends and foes, by the harmlessness of the dove.

But as Cicero's orator was to combine a broad circle of rare qualifications, so this strong specimen of Christian and ministerial influence had other estimable properties. One of these was great kindness of heart. In all circles, there was in his looks an unearthly glow of benevolence. He seemed to *feel* that good will toward every one about him, which the hollow forms of society lead many awkwardly to affect. We seldom witness so fine a model of the Christian gentleman.

Few have shown so much exactness of method in all their

movements, or so uniform promptness in the execution of their purposes.

Dr. Hyde was among the good scholars of his time ; systematic in his theological views, more biblical than philosophical, yet of extensive reading in the range of his profession. Few clergymen have given themselves so wholly to their appropriate work ; very few ever laid aside their professional dress so little, at home or abroad.

His acquaintance with men of worth and influence was uncommonly large. And the report of his sterling worth as an intelligent, a humble, devoted, successful minister of Christ, went out through a far wider circle than his personal friends. This fact, wherever he travelled the latter portion of his life, was sure to procure him a hearty welcome with the best people in his course, and to prepare the way for his usefulness in their society. He had but to give his name, and he was among acquaintance. And no man better knew how to improve these opportunities. He was in his very element, when he might preach Christ, and impart some spiritual good, in such new and transient circles. A man of general intelligence and good conversational powers, fond of personal history, and anxious at all times to be useful, it was his recreation to converse with strangers, and leave with them no doubtful proof, either of his own worth or of the excellence of religion. In suitable connexions, he was ready to hold discourse on the topics of the day, whether science or literature, general politics, morals or religion.

It would be difficult to imagine a more happy illustration of the intimate union of sound doctrinal belief with ardent practical piety. No man could be more firmly settled in a belief of the Calvinistic doctrines of decrees and personal election ; few preached them so often, so ably, and with such naked plainness ; yet very few have been equally diligent and untiring in the use of divinely sanctioned means, in all their variety, to bring man to repentance.

For nothing was Dr. Hyde's ministry more distinguished than for a marked appropriateness. With a tender care for the individuals in his flock, and with much of their personal history treasured in his memory, his performance at their funerals was alike various and appropriate, tender, solemn and impressive. No remarkable event of providence, did he suffer to pass without an effort to make it tell for the good of his people.

He was always at his post. Even Washington was not

more indebted for his celebrity and usefulness to the memorable "*half hour*," than was Dr. Hyde to his early attendance on his appointments. Unlike some good ministers, he never learned to say in excuse of absence; "It was rainy"—"There was a severe snow storm"—"The roads were almost impassable"—"The cold was intense"—"My health was poor." No; if he failed to meet his appointments, either in his own parish, or in the wider range of county or state—for he made many long journeys in his Master's service—he was presumed to have a reason that would pass at the bar of Christ.

Even in advanced life, and in an age of great changes, he kept up with the *good* spirit of the times. "Proving all things," as they passed in rapid but careful review before his perspicacious eye, he was ready to "hold fast" whatever seemed to promise a balance of "good." Nor was he willing to enjoy any valuable thing alone: he took early pains to recommend it to his people, quite sure of enlisting their reason, their hearts and their hands in its favour. Hence the fact, that his congregation were ahead of most others in good things; taking the commendable lead in charitable contributions, in the temperance cause, in Sabbath school operations, and mainly through the exertion and influence of their pastor. They saw his own views of duty, and his earnestness for their co-operation, and their confidence in his tried wisdom inclined them to follow his suggestions with equal promptness and cheerfulness.

We have reserved for the last particular the grand secret of his strength. About a year before his death, this question was put to one of his clerical friends; "Where lies the secret of Dr. Hyde's great power over his fellow men, from the lowest to the highest? What is the charm, which all classes, as if spell-bound, always feel in his presence?" "O," said the clergyman without hesitancy, "**'TIS HIS HOLINESS.**" Of the correctness of this reply we have no doubt. His piety had great depth and equal fervour, and it was uniform and very practical in all situations. This single thing, more than his every other quality, fixed all eyes, arrested all ears, and prepared the motionless listener for deep, salutary, lasting impressions. This placed him, in every circle, on a high pedestal. This gave him such power with the closeted individual. This moved the clock-work in his own family, and as he passed along the street

awed the noisy children into silence, and in the twinkling of an eye changed the gay to the grave. This made the glance of his eye so terrible to the wicked. It was the charm, while he examined the primary school, the academy, the college. It added no little weight to his opinions in the conference room, and to his counsels and prayers by the bed of sickness and of death. It was the secret of his rich preparations in the study, and of his mightier power than mere human eloquence ever wields in the pulpit. Yes, it was holiness, pre-eminently, which seemed to form the basis of his integrity, his decision, his frankness, his strong common sense, his exact movement, his look of kindness chastened with gravity,—all his estimable features. This presided over his intellect, warmed his heart, shone in his looks, burned in his words, directed his actions. Every body saw, that instead of winding round and round in the narrow circle of *self*, his daily favourite movement was in a broad orbit—the glory of God its bright and fixed centre, around which he seemed naturally and delightfully to revolve. Does the great power of the orator lie in "*action, action, action!*" The great power of Dr. Hyde seems to have been *holiness, holiness, holiness*.

Shall we not then regard him as a very *good*, and also a truly *great* man? in the highest and best sense, *GREAT*. Call it, if you please, the greatness of goodness. For, why should the epithet great, in application to men, be limited to a high degree of intellectual strength? Is even the nobler part of man *all intellect*? Must his stature be measured by this rule simply? May not a *benevolent, holy direction* of the physical energies of the soul come into the estimate? And may not a very large degree of this holy influence, entitle a man to the distinction of *great*? Nay, is it not strictly correct to pronounce him the *greatest* man, whose intellectual and moral powers in union, actually accomplish, by the grace of God, the largest amount of good? If great enlargement of soul for the welfare of others; if untiring perseverance in benevolent effort; if a combination of sterling qualities, always in harmonious action, and successful also to an extent almost without parallel in human annals; if a first rate power to sway other minds, from the least to the largest, in every variety of situation; if all this be not true *greatness*, then where do we find it in our little world and among our low-stature-race?

Partiality to one's native county and town, would fain cast a veil over the last few weeks of this distinguished servant of Jesus Christ. But then the miniature would be less complete—the crown of martyrdom would be wanting. The picture can only take its highest finish from this greatest trial in his life, as the finishing touches of our Saviour's character are derived from the sublime scene of his crucifixion. Dr Hyde's earthly labours were brought suddenly to a close, December 4, 1833: time of sad memory to Zion, when the county of Berkshire had been set on fire by a certain pseudo "revival preacher" from the west; one of "the first three" of that class; and when the hottest flames were raging in and around his thrice loved Lee. Never before was the good man in such a furnace. "My family afflictions," he now said to an intimate friend, "have never been so keen a trial, and came so near my heart, as the interruption of that harmony and order, which have contributed so much to the prosperity of the churches in Berkshire." But in this severest of his trials, his faith failed not; his confidence in God wavered not; he stood firm for the truth—the gold was not consumed, but made more pure and bright. 'Though for a while he could almost say with Paul, "No man stood with me," yet the grace of God kept him from deserting his post. Amid reproaches loud and bitter, as well from former friends as from foes, he could meekly say, "I view the whole as a needful correction, and desire to be humble under the rod which my heavenly Father has laid upon me. I have deserved it all, and much more." Instead of sinking in despondency, he, like David in a similar trial, "gave himself unto prayer." He also redoubled his labours night and day, to save if possible his scattering flock, and the churches around him, which were scarcely less dear to his heart. This pressure on his soul and body was too much. Sleep departed. Health failed. He had been no stranger to deep grief. He had survived the untimely death of a fifth dear child. But his deeper sorrows now for Zion in her extreme perils broke his heart; reminding us of an ancient priest, who, after a forty years' service of the Church, could hear the news of his slain sons and not fall back and die, till the more painful fact was added, "the ark of God is taken."

Sometimes the natural sun sets amid clouds, and lightning and tempest, yet its setting seems to disperse all the gloom, and then it sends its bright rays from its position below the horizon, far up on the western firmament to cheer

the eye, and gladden the heart of the beholder. Not altogether unlike this, was the departure of the man at which we have now glanced. If his sun, in respect to his people and the vicinity, did set in a terrific storm, after adorning an almost cloudless sky, and with equal benignity and majesty for the space of forty years, yet the universal chill felt on its sudden withdrawal, was immediately followed by golden pencils of rays, spreading themselves far and wide over the late dark sky. When, in the righteous chastisement of a community, God reached down his hand from heaven, and took up this second Enoch to himself, "all faces gathered blackness," the murmurs against the good man were at once hushed, and one loud and bitter wail rung on the ear. So severe a frown in the removal of a pastor, few churches are in a situation to deserve; for only a very few can be ungrateful for the gift and long continuance of one so good. While Berkshire may well mourn, the scourging hand was doubtless holy, and the man of God might himself need the purifying process of this very trial, after so many years of unusual prosperity, to complete his own preparation for heaven, and fit him for a richer crown.

Whatever difference of opinion there might have been among even good people, amid the dust and noise of these sorrowful scenes, the lapse of five years may now enable the Christian public to see truth and error in strong contrast. At this sober distance, it would seem easy to distinguish the mere tinsel from the beaten gold; "the crackling of thorns" from "the still, small voice" of God. The candid Christian may surely see a broad difference between the wise husbandman, who with mingled hope and anxiety marks his whitening fields, and then with due care gathers the precious grain, and the reckless vagrant who thrusts himself into "another man's labours," and prostrates fences, and scatters and tramples down much that a more careful hand might have saved: between "grievous wolves entering in, not sparing the flock," and the shepherd who had grown prematurely gray in exhausting efforts for his loved charge, tenderly "gathering the lambs with his arms, and carrying them in his bosom." The stranger, who approaches from the east the pleasant village of Lee, may see on a sadly populous hillock the taper white marble over the martyr's grave, and sigh more for the fanaticism of the times when he fell, than for any peculiar fickleness of one of the loveliest cluster of churches in the world.

ART. V.—CRIMINALITY IN MINISTERS OF SUPPRESSING OR
OPPOSING THE DOCTRINES OF THE GOSPEL.

THAT it is the duty of those who enter the sacred ministry, to make the word of God the sole guide of their instructions, and impartially to declare all its counsels; that to deny or suppress its doctrines for the purpose of pleasing men, or advancing the interests of ambition, is to act the part of a traitor to the office, in place of discharging its obligations, would seem to be too plainly true to be overlooked, and too important to be forgotten by any who have made the Scriptures their study. They are ambassadors for God; commissioned to make known to men his will. Their authority to speak in his name is solely derived from him; and the revelations of his word are the message, and the sole message, which they are appointed to declare. To discharge that duty, they must of course deliver and enforce every part of that message, without reserve and without partiality.

It can scarcely, however, escape attentive observers that by not a few of those now in the ministry, very different views are entertained of their duties; that they regard it as far from being clear that they are implicitly to follow the word of God in their teachings; neither rejecting or suppressing any of its doctrines, nor substituting others in their place. They publicly assert, indeed, that the Scriptures are not of paramount authority in religion; that they have in the decisions of reason at least an equal, if not a superior. They boldly claim also, that no necessity exists of a coincidence of the belief which they profess with the views which they entertain; that they may without guilt assert their conviction of the truth of that which they do not hold; and hold and teach that which they disown. Beyond these, there is a still more numerous class who appear to regard themselves as invested with the right of consulting a worldly expediency in preaching the doctrines of the gospel, and manifesting their assent to them; and are accustomed accordingly to suppress the one in the desk when they seem likely to give offence; and conceal the other when in the presence of those with whom the avowal of their faith might render them unpopular.

That this disowning, however, of the truths of the gospel, as the hope of popularity, power and wealth may happen to prompt, is deeply guilty, is manifest from the source from which it emanates, and the consequences to which it gives birth.

The principle in which it has its origin is atheistic. They who in that manner disavow or conceal the truth, proceed on the assumption, either that God is not the author of those injunctions in the Scriptures which prohibit it, or that he has no right to impose such a law. They manifestly act on the ground that it is not obligatory; that they have another and higher rule of conduct; and treat the Most High, therefore, as having no right to prescribe their course. Such is the import of their conduct, the only construction it can bear. To claim that it can be otherwise, were to admit their practice to be wholly inexcusable. If God has a right to impose on his ministers such a law as is enjoined on them in the Scriptures, and is the author of that law, it then is obligatory, and to disregard it is open and formal rebellion. In claiming their course then to be justifiable, they arrogate a superiority to his commands, and with all the emphasis which the most significant actions can express, deny his right to prescribe their duty, or require their obedience in the sacred office:—a course most grossly solecistical, as well as impious. It is absurd to assume that the ministers of the gospel are the ambassadors of God—messengers commissioned by him to declare his will, the whole of whose official work and authority is of his appointment and gift—and yet to claim that he has no authority over their office; no right to determine what message they shall deliver. It renders their whole official work and pretence to a divine commission, a farce also. On what ground can they claim his sanction to their office, if they deny his right to determine its duties? or that their hearers are bound to submit to their instructions, as of divine authority, while denying that he has a right to enjoin those instructions? In wresting from him that right, they divest their ministry of his sanction, and sink it into an unauthorized assumption.

But the impiety of their course is equally manifest. As they cannot attempt to justify their disavowal or suppression of the truth, except by assuming that they are not bound to teach it, and cannot assume that, except on the ground that God has no absolute authority over them; they are guilty in

every instance in which they disown or conceal the doctrines of his word, of a formal denial of his authority ; and that is a denial of his perfections, relations, and rights as God. And what more fearful spectacle of presumption and impiety can creatures exhibit, than that which they thus present, when the office which he instituted for the vindication of his perfections and rights, and manifestation of his truth, is perverted to their denial, and the subordination of his interests and will to the lawless wishes of mortals ;—the caprices of vanity, ambition and avarice ! The principle from which this suppression of his truth emanates, is thus manifestly antichristian ; the soul and substance of atheism.

As the source in which it has its origin is atheistic in its denial of his authority, so it is in its preference of worldly good above the blessings of salvation. The motive from which they act, who thus set aside his will, is one of mere wealth, power or popularity ; and they proceed in it, on the ground, that these are of greater value than those ; they place on them a higher estimate, and treat them as better entitled to their choice. They act, therefore, on the assumption, either that the blessings of salvation have no existence, or that the representations given of them in the Scriptures are not true. They exhibit not only a want of perfect faith in them, but offer them the most emphatic denial in their power. In thus exalting the objects of worldly ambition above the blessings of redemption, and disregarding the promises and threatenings of God, they cast on them all the slight, and offer to his authority all the injury, which they would by a formal denial of his rights or existence. They act, therefore, the part of infidelity ; or, in the just and terrific language of the sacred word, “ make God a liar ;”—a sin of the greatest guilt in those who are set apart to the work of vindicating his authority, and persuading men to obey it. What more dreadful spectacle can be imagined than they exhibit when they thus deny the rights which it is their business to maintain, and depreciate instead of exalting the work of Christ ; acting the part of a treacherous Judas who betrays, and ambitious priests who crucify, in place of disciples who forsake all and follow him. If the inordinate love of worldly good by those out of the sacred office be idolatry, how much more is it in his ministers, who heighten their guilt by making his temple the scene of their apostate worship, and offer sacrifice upon his altars to their idols.

Such are the principles on which they proceed. But the guilt of their course is manifest also by the fruits to which it gives birth, as well as the false views from which it springs. It naturally leads to erroneous representations of the whole system of the gospel, and gives rise thereby to a false religion.

It were a contradiction to suppose that they will teach the pure gospel, who consult in their preaching the dictates of a mere worldly policy, and accommodate their doctrines to the tastes of their hearers. It were to assume that the doctrines and injunctions of the sacred word coincide with their passions and prejudices, and exhibit the motives, and exert the influences which are most congenial to a selfish temper. But in place of that, where worldliness, pride and ambition preside in the sacred desk, its instructions will be found as hostile as those affections themselves are to the gospel. The perfections and claims of God will be denied, or kept out of sight; the most essential truths of his word discarded, conscience lulled into insensibility, and the heart flattered with false reliances and deceptive hopes. The religion inculcated will, in short, be such as meets the wishes of an unsanctified mind; the homage it exacts will be the homage of self, and not of God.

It were in vain, also, to expect a just exhibition of the sacred word from those who make the selfish passions their guide in the sacred office. How can they vindicate the rights or assert the authority of God over others, while rejecting them in respect to themselves; or rebuke forbidden passions, or dissuade from a worldly temper, while making them the law of their own lives? How can they impress their hearers with the superior claims of heavenly things, while acting in the most momentous concerns of life, in opposite views; while, by sacrificing the interests of eternity to those of time, they treat the latter as of infinitely the highest worth? How excite a just sense of the Redeemer's work, while disparaging and rejecting its blessings for the low enjoyments and worthless acquisitions of this life? It were solecistical to expect it from them. They who deliberately disown or suppress the doctrines of revelation to subserve the ends of a worldly ambition, cannot have those views of God and his truth which are essential to a just exhibition of any part of the gospel; nor, if they entertained them in theory, are their affections such as are requisite to

that work. None but they who see the beauty and feel the power of truth, can exhibit to others its attractions and enforce its claims. None but they who have been led by the spirit of grace to a just discernment and sense of the glory of Christ's work, can present it to others in its true relations ; exhibit it in its transcendent majesty. To expect the gospel in its due proportions, its genuine character from a worldly ambitious minister, who is ready under the promptings of selfishness and impiety, deliberately to disown and conceal its doctrines, were to expect light to emanate from darkness ; to look for grapes from thorns and figs from thistles.

But not only may it be expected, that they will exhibit false representations of many parts of the gospel, and inadequate apprehensions of others which they do not intentionally misrepresent, and thereby give birth to false hopes in their hearers ; but the selfishness by which they are prompted may be expected to lead them to direct efforts to propagate a spurious piety, and multiply false converts as a means of advancing their reputation and influence. As power, popularity and wealth are the supreme objects of their aim, and as the direct means of gaining them are the repute of a successful ministry, and the multiplication of those who are placed under their immediate charge, those means will, as a matter of course be above all others chosen. Let the regions be examined where those ministers have labored, who made their office the instrument of their pride and love of power, and they will be found to be the scenes where illegitimate excitements have been fomented and cherished, false conversions multiplied, and the Church filled with the unsanctified and self-deceived. The corruption of the Church by the introduction of false doctrines, and false disciples, is then the natural result of such a ministry.

Another evil usually attendant on the policy in question, is the formation and nurture in the Church of a zealous and active party for the support of its authors, and the promotion of their interests. The minister who disowns and traduces the truth for the purpose of advancing his selfish aims, will naturally be inclined to avail himself of other means, if in his power, to subserve those ends ; and as one of the readiest methods of acquiring and exerting an influence is the organization of a party, in which large numbers can be made to act with promptness and ardor in subservience to

an individual, that expedient is usually one of the first adopted, and it is as naturally the chief business of an organization so formed, to disseminate and give popularity to the false views of its head. But the formation of such a party, is one of the greatest evils to which the church is ever subjected. When an individual disconnected with others, and unambitious of notoriety, falls into error, and contents himself with inculcating it in the narrow circle within his immediate influence, his false doctrines are comparatively harmless. But when one of a restless and aspiring temper, embracing essential error, attempts to make it the instrument of conspicuity and aggrandizement, and forms for that purpose a subservient party, the evil obtains a much more rapid and extensive diffusion, and advances to a far greater intensity. The dissemination of error is then made the direct and sole object of the party, is accomplished with a speed proportioned to the numbers who are united in it, and the vigor with which their efforts are directed.

But those, who from motives of worldly policy withhold the truth of the gospel from their people, usually are not long content with concealing it. They soon find themselves under the necessity, in order to accomplish their end, of advancing still farther, and exhibiting an open hostility to the truth and its friends. Regarding its prevalence as unfavorable to their aims, the same reasons that induce them to conceal it from their people, will also, when it is presented to them by others, lead them to endeavour to disarm it of its influence by assailing it, and misrepresenting its supporters. Those who faithfully teach the doctrines which they disown, will be viewed as antagonists, and employed in obstructing their schemes. Thus in effect assailed they as a matter of course assume the attitude of defence, and from neglecters and disowners of the truth, immediately become its open and resolute opponents; and prompted as they are by unprincipled passions, their warfare is marked by all the ingenuity of a sharpened selfishness, and the malignity of jealous ambition. Let the whole hosts of the enemies of the gospel be scanned, and those of them who are the most active, the most fertile of expedients, and the most relentless and implacable, will be found to be—not they who are prompted in their hostility by sincere convictions—but they who are governed by a rank and unprincipled lust of popularity and power. They are its bitterest enemies; for they hate it,

not because they believe it to be error, but because, though they know it to be truth, they regard it as an obstacle to their wishes. Their hostility is thence a deliberate and deadly malice, whose aim can only be accomplished by the extinction of the object against which it is directed.

It scarcely needs to be remarked, that the influence of this course on the morals of those who pursue it, is pernicious in the highest degree. Accustomed in so important a part of their agency to disregard the authority of God, they soon learn to break over a wider circle of restraint, and become evil generally in their practice as well as their principles. Subordinating all other interests to the demands of selfishness, they are withheld by no scruples from the use of whatever means may promote the attainment of its objects — Intrigue, treachery, misrepresentation, calumny, are accordingly employed by them with as little reluctance as others. How indeed can it be otherwise? How can a scrupulous veracity, an inflexible uprightness, a sacred regard to the rights and welfare of men, in other relations of life, be expected of those who exhibit a total absence of them toward God; who are false and malicious in the office of the sacred ministry?

After religion itself, with all its infinite sanctions has been trampled in the dust, how can it be expected that any inferior inducements to the social virtues which may be deemed still to subsist, can command a paramount regard? All history of the past, presents a different result. We search in vain for virtue in those who are governed in the sacred office by a worldly ambition. Whited indeed, like sepulchres, and beautiful without they may appear to distant spectators, but an interior inspection will discover them to be fraught only with the elements of pestilence and death. They who fear not God, are not accustomed justly to regard men. They who are supremely selfish and treacherous in the most momentous concerns, are not likely to be marked by integrity in affairs of inferior importance. The shipwreck of the faith, may justly be expected as a natural consequence of swerving from a good conscience, but a shipwreck of morals, is directly involved in a conscious and deliberate departure from the faith.

Such is the usual, the natural career of those who make the sacred office the instrument of vanity and ambition; and they as naturally persevere in it without reform to the

end of life. Abandoned to the sway of selfish affections, forsaken of the Spirit of God, inflamed with a deadly hostility to the truth, they are surrendered wholly to the dominion of evil influences, and going on from worse to worse, live and die in open warfare against God. Such is the spectacle exhibited by all those whose history is presented in the sacred volume; Korah, Balaam, the false prophets cotemporary with Jeremiah, Judas Iscariot, Diotrephes; and such is their history in all subsequent ages. Deliberate and malignant enemies of the truth, like those that blaspheme the Spirit of God, they seem never to have forgiveness either in this life, or in that which is to come.

This view of the principles on which they act, who thus swerve from their duty, and the career which they usually run, leads to a melancholy estimate of not a few now in the sacred office. That there are numbers in the churches who have two sets of doctrines, to be avowed or disowned as exigencies require; one which they profess when desirous to appear orthodox, but which they withhold from their people; another which they disown in their professions, but zealously inculcate in the desk, is a fact of general notoriety. Recently large assemblages of them have united in asserting their faith in doctrines which they are well known not to entertain, and denying their belief in others which they notoriously hold and inculcate. What views then are we to entertain of their principles? What are the characteristics which they exhibit, if they be not those of infidelity? In the most important relations which they sustain; in the most momentous of their public acts, they proceed in the assumption that the great doctrines and representations of the gospel have no paramount claims to their respect—are of no truth or significance—are put to their proper use indeed when made the mere instrument of worldly aims; when bartered for a mess of pottage, or sold for thirty pieces of silver. Are they not then infidels at heart, and believers only in pretence? No other judgment can be rationally formed of them. Such a practice cannot subsist with that faith which is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen; which working by love, and purifying the heart from inordinate attachment to earthly good, overcomes the world. The utter absence in them of these traits, is the most absolute proof that they are destitute of true faith; that their religion is not a principle, but a profes-

sion, not a deep seated and predominant affection, but an artifice whose end is attained, when wealth, popularity and power are its fruits.

How fearful is the doom which awaits such ministers in the next world ! Having denied Christ here before men—he will there deny them before the father and the holy angels. They will not be acknowledged as his friends who would not here acknowledge his authority over them. They will not then be received to his kingdom, who would not here submit to his reign. With what a sense of their presumption will they be overwhelmed when they find that the infinite Being, with whose rights and authority they had trifled, indeed exists, the creator, possessor and ruler of the universe, and that his rectitude, aversion to sin, and purpose respecting its punishment, are such as his word represents. With what agony will they contemplate the prostitution of their office to the purposes of ambition—the rejection of the blessings of an immortal life, for the transient distinctions, the guilty enjoyments of this.

ART. VI.—MINISTERS AND THEIR INFLUENTIAL HEARERS.

By the REV. J. B. WATERBURY, of Hudson, N. Y.

EVERY faithful minister, who has had a few years' experience in his work, has seen and felt the extreme difficulty of so presenting the truth before the impenitent mind, as to bring upon it a conviction of personal guilt and danger. It is in no disrespect for the office-work of the Holy Spirit that we thus speak ; for we do not, for a moment, concede to man a power to produce that conviction which terminates in the conversion of the soul to God. But must not such means be used and such arguments adduced as, in their nature and tendency, are adapted to produce conviction ? Certainly they must. We should preach, both with respect to matter and manner, as if the salvation of souls depended on the force of our logic, and the pungency of our appeals ; whilst, at the same time, we are to remember that all will be vain unless God shall give the increase. On this point there is, we

apprehend no diversity of sentiment among the faithful servants of Christ.

But ministers of the present age, in their official efforts to save souls, lie under difficulties and embarrassments peculiar to the state of society in which they live. When the apostles and primitive preachers went forth to proclaim the gospel, besides being men of preeminent piety, and in numerous instances, gifted with miraculous powers, they had, in some respects, a more favorable field of operations. We do not mean that they met with a reception more cordial, or encountered prejudices less violent, and a depravity of lighter shade; for in these respects their difficulties were certainly as great as ours; but we allude to the fact that there existed a strong line of demarcation between those who embraced and those who opposed the doctrine of the cross. Men were *for* Christ, openly, avowedly, or they were *against* him. The Jew was obstinate and full of hatred against the innovators; so also was the proud and polished Greek. The lines being thus visibly and distinctly drawn, there were none who could long take shelter under the covert of professed neutrality.

At this primitive period, also, congregations were not organized in the manner, and according to the principles, precisely, which characterise those of our times; where men, not improperly termed "almost Christian," are as numerous as the professors of religion; and where such men, *externally* at least, are as scrupulous in the discharge of the social duties as many of the pious are. The first preachers of the cross had, it is true, the difficult task of demolishing pre-existing systems, but they had not in general the hard and almost hopeless one of showing, that two men may be apparently honest and generous, amiable and moral, and yet the one be a friend, and the other an enemy of God. So diverse is the state of society now from that in which they lived and labored, as to require of us more vigilance, in some respects, than in them, lest, for want of proper discrimination in our preaching, men shall suppose themselves safe when they are sinking to perdition.

At the present day, and especially in the country where it is our privilege to labor, all are nominally christian. They stand classed, generally, in two divisions, *professors* and *non-professors*. The former includes, doubtless, the great body of real Christians. Among them may be some who are self-deceived, and a few, we hope very few, who have assumed

the cloak of religion, the more effectually to conceal their characters and their crimes.

In the class of *non*-professors, are included not only the careless and the unprincipled, but thousands of respectable, serious, and we may, without disparagement of the gospel, add, "almost Christian" men. These support our religious institutions with no less liberality than those who are in the communion of the church. They constitute, in many instances, the bone and muscle of our organized congregations. It is often *their* money which builds our churches, and which supports our ministers. It is their influence, in many cases, which sustains the respectability of gospel institutions in communities, which would otherwise openly vilify them. Where is the congregation which numbers not some such among its supporters!

It is impossible not to respect the feelings which lead these men to such a decided patronage of the gospel. They are sometimes among the minister's best friends. Their seat in the sanctuary is seldom vacant, nor is their eye averted when the preacher addresses to them the sacred message. They manifest a becoming gravity towards every thing sacred; and oftentimes challenge, as to their outward demeanor, a comparison with the members of the church. They do not indeed come out and declare themselves on the Lord's side, nor do they give any decisive proofs, of a positive nature, that they have been born again. They are cold on the great subject of vital, experimental religion.

Among *non*-professors this class, if not very numerous, has of late been increasing and there is a solemn question for ministers to meet; how have they been treated? Is there not in their character, as upright and amiable men a difficulty in the way of convincing them of their depravity and ruin! We believe that they may be all that we have described, and not be Christians. They may take as high a stand as the young ruler in the gospel—keep the commandments of the second table, and even kneel at the feet of Jesus, and ask what more must be done; whilst still they may lack that one thing, the want of which will forever shut them out of heaven. Until convinced of their sinfulness, they will not cry for mercy; and how, or by what means are they to *be* convinced? Is it replied, "the Holy Ghost alone can break their fatal slumber." True: but

must we not approach them with such means and methods as the Holy Spirit will be likely to own and to bless? The position which they have taken is a commendable one, but it is at a point short of actual conversion; and believing as we do, we must not rest until they go further, until they are "new creatures in Christ Jesus."

The difficulty of lodging conviction in these minds may be seen, when, on the one hand, they can point to the flagrantly immoral, between whom and themselves a self-flattering contrast may be drawn, and on the other, to many professors of religion, whose lax deportment furnishes them with an equally self-justifying plea. What can be said, when arguments the most powerful are turned aside by such comparisons and allusions! Do not ministers feel the pressure of this difficulty: and are not the very men, who are apparently nearest the kingdom of heaven, in danger of being lost, to all eternity, under our ministry? Here is a field for ministerial faithfulness and discrimination. These men act, to some extent, under the influence of Christianity. Many things which they do are to be commended. *Externally* there is little to charge against them. Their sins appear to be of the occult kind. They lie in the state of their hearts. See then, with what difficulty their conviction seems to be attended; and how almost impossible it is to make them perceive and acknowledge—to say nothing of making them *feel*—the necessity of being born again in order to fit them for heaven. Yet such is the necessity in *their* case as in all others. Until they feel it, and act upon it, they are in danger of dropping into perdition. Yes, with all their kindness of disposition, natural nobleness of soul, and liberal support of gospel institutions, they must be born again, or they cannot see the kingdom of God. Are we aiming to convince them of this? Are we, with the sword of the spirit, dexterously disarming them of their weapons, and laying open their bosoms to the blow? Are we touching them in those points where they will feel, and where their close-fitted panoply cannot protect them? Are we in tenderness, yet with unsparing fidelity, stripping them of the folds of that self-righteousness in which for years they have been sedulously wrapping themselves? Do we deal with *them* as we deal with the humbler classes? Are there no temptations to unfaithfulness here?

But the difficulty of answering their objections is not the

only one which embarrasses us. These men are in danger of losing their souls from other causes. Constituting, as they often do, the pillars of our congregations, being frequently men of wealth or talents, and therefore men of influence, there is a strong temptation pressing on the minister to seek and to secure their favor. It is not in human nature to be indifferent to such favor; nor is it even in *sanctified* human nature, though clothed with the awful responsibilities of the ministry, to be perfectly indifferent to it. It is evident that, in view of the possibility of such an influence being cast about him, to trammel him in his bold and uncompromising course, the apostle Paul chose to be dependent for his support upon the labor of his own hands. He was determined that no man should take from him his power over the conscience. It was in part this independent stand which gave him such free scope in his noble enterprise of love.

We would not insinuate that ministers of the present time—we refer to those in our own connection—are absolutely unfaithful in the application of truth to the consciences of such men as we have alluded to. We do not assert that apprehension of wounding their feelings, or of losing their support, or of driving them to other churches operates so strongly as to make the watchman cry peace, or to keep back entirely the note of alarm. If it be so in any case it is lamentable, and the danger then is, that not only will these men lose their souls, but that the minister may share the same tremendous fate.

But we cannot believe, as it respects their pulpit labors, that our ministers are unfaithful. *There* generally they feel the startling import of their commission. Still even there, on the very watch-tower, they are at times strongly tempted to accommodate the known feelings of such as we have described. There is a struggle in the minister's bosom between his sense of responsibility to God and his natural desire to please, or at least not deeply to wound the feelings of those whom he greatly respects. If added to this, there be felt a dependence for support on such men, the danger to their souls is proportionably enhanced. Will the strong arm then draw forth the arrows of the Almighty, and fearlessly launch them at the very hearts of such hearers? What powerful temptations will exist to induce us to blunt their point or hurl them with uncertain aim? How many apologies for uttering painful truths are sometimes cowardly insinuated, which

make these men feel that eternal retribution is a part of our theory, but not a prominent and permanent item of belief. O for the spirit of him who spake "as pleasing God and not men"! It was immaterial to him whether he was preaching to Lydia the seller of purple, or to Felix and Agrippa the *wearers* of purple; he was equally the bold, uncompromising minister of the cross. The *souls* of men, and not their relative position in society, elicited his interest and awakened his anxiety. This is the spirit which we should covet, and which to approve ourselves faithful we must possess. Has it never occurred to us, that souls are likely to be lost under our ministry for the want of this very bold and faithful spirit! We are appointed to preach the gospel to men of influence and of refinement; to men of morality; to men who treat us and our office with great respect, and who contribute liberally to our support. We owe these men much. We are deeply their debtors. But in what way are we to repay them? By flattery? By accommodating their tastes? By so guaging our address as to secure their approbation of our preaching? Poor recompense this. Their dying breath may thus be employed in venting maledictions instead of invoking blessings on our heads. Let us not, by our silence, nor by our tame and yielding and accommodating policy prepare the way for their upbraidings in a dying hour. Let us give them to understand, that mere respecters of religion are not religious men. Let us, with a firm and steady hand, pass the probe into their diseased nature, and show them that what *they* considered sound is a deep and deadly sore. We must not suffer them to lie down on the very cushions of the altar, and sleep there the sleep of death. It must be our constant aim, while rejoicing in their good feeling towards religion, to show them that they "must be born again," that "whosoever is not *with* Christ is *against* him."

We have selected this class of hearers of the gospel to show two things; the difficulty of bringing home the truth upon men's minds, and the danger that exists lest, for want of proper efforts on this point some of the very best of our hearers may, even on the high road of Christian privileges, and under our own ministry, go down to hell. Are we making vigorous efforts to save these men? Does our eye fall upon them with fear or with favor as we look upon them from the pulpit wrapped in their garments of self-righteousness or soothed into security by a complacent contrast of their

characters with the openly vicious? And when we meet them do we accommodate their worldly tone, and converse on every topic but that very one in which they are most deeply deficient? Do we give room for the surmise that our religion is a professional rather than a practical matter? Do we allow the feeling of surprise to take possession of them, because, though so often in their company, we seldom or never make an effort for their salvation? How can we make men feel their sins but by an affectionate yet faithful appeal to their consciences? Be they high or low, moral or vicious, there is but one course to pursue with all. We have not accomplished our work, when we have preached to the poor, however faithfully we may have done it. The hardest task yet remains; it is to commune unsparingly with the Josephs and the Nicodemuses; to invade the frowning impediments which lie between us and our influential hearers. It is to acknowledge no difference between *their* souls and those of the meanest. We must see nothing to obstruct us in their code of fashion; nor in their lofty ceilings, their gorgeous furniture, and their splendid equipages. The possessors of these things have souls, and we should remember that we are commissioned to labor for their salvation.

Our efforts to bring this class to gospel humility, must be proportioned to the difficulties to be encountered. We have spoken of our temptations to unfaithfulness; we might allude, also to the fact that such minds have a tremendous struggle before they can yield to the claims of the gospel. Their very prominence in society operates as a powerful impediment. They must descend further than others before they can reach the vale of gospel humility. They must sacrifice more. The contrast between their condition as worldly men, and their self-abasement as convicted sinners, is so great as to arrest public attention and often excite surprise. This operates on their pride to keep them aloof from the means of conviction. All this ministers should consider. "Of some have compassion;" and of none more than these.

More of these hearers may be saved. We are deeply responsible on this point. We must preach to them such doctrine, and with such discrimination as will be calculated to prepare the way for a more private and personal interview. We must watch for opportunities when such private communion may be had. Take them alone. Approach them with that courtesy which their circumstances de-

mand, and yet with that fidelity which the obligations of the ministry impose. We heard a venerable father in Christ once observe that the reason all the influential members of his congregation were pious men was owing, under God, to his faithful private interviews with them. He found them ready to listen. God blessed the means; and a more liberal, active, and efficient congregation, in proportion to its size, exists not in the United States.

We are too apt to rest satisfied, with our pulpit labors. We think our duty discharged when, in all good conscience, we have preached the truth of God. But it is not so. We must follow up our public labors by private communion with our hearers. We must take hold of the mind before the world preoccupies it with its desolating influence. We know not what impressions may, under the exhibition of truth, have been made. We cannot say but that some of these hearers have gone from the sanctuary with solemn purposes of repentance. The Spirit of God may have left on their souls a heavy burden. But mark the danger. Satan is there to catch away the seed. A thousand worldly associations meet them at the threshold of the temple. The flood of temporal cares comes rushing in upon the soul. The week opens with its plans and its excitements. What then becomes of the Sabbath-day impression? Is there no danger that it will be effaced? Will the still small voice be heard amid such a deluge of vanities? In these circumstances let ministers be on the alert. Let them notice the serious countenance or the falling tear, and be beforehand with the world. Let them follow up these Sabbath-day impressions with untiring efforts through the week, and there is reason to believe that in many instances, "souls will be converted from the error of their ways."

The impression is too general that ministers pursue their calling like other professional men, and for the same reasons; that it is their living, or that it is for the sake of standing and influence. What will disabuse the public mind so effectually as the course we are recommending? We may preach with the eloquence of Apollos, and men will pay us for it in patronage and polite attentions; but they may at the same time secretly think that, after all, the ministry is but a theatre for the exhibition of our talents. But let us come down from the pulpit, awed by a sense of our high responsibilities, and mingle among our hearers, to see what effect

truth has wrought in their consciences. With affectionate interest for their souls' salvation, let us inquire if they understood and felt the subject. Let it be evident that we are anxious less to secure their approbation and to retain their support than to save their immortal souls from death. This is the way to convince men of our sincerity, to stop the mouths of gainsayers, and to robe the ministry with its original grandeur.

Men are seldom effectually brought to a sense of duty under our preaching until we show some special personal interest in their welfare. All that we do in the desk, they consider as done officially, and no more for them than for others. But when we visit them ; converse with them ; respectfully meet their objections ; lend them books such as their state of mind calls for ; study their peculiar prejudices and endeavor to remove them ; when we thus do, they are convinced that we feel a particular and personal interest in their salvation. They will seldom stand out against such affectionate and persevering efforts. God, we believe, will bless these means to their conviction and conversion. So important do we consider this mode of dealing with souls, that where it is never resorted to, we confidently predict but little fruit of the ministry.

Ministers must also individualize more than they have been accustomed to do. On the Sabbath we treat with our hearers in the mass. We inculcate the great principles of the gospel, and leave each one to apply them to himself. But, in addition to this, we should single out each soul and inquire what is its peculiar situation, its prejudices, its external embarrassments ; and what are the means most likely, under God, to arouse its perception of its guilt and danger. Our great Master has set us the example of laboring to convince the individual sinner of his guilt. The case of Nicodemus is in point. Another instance is that of the Samaritan woman, and Zaccheus the publican is another. Were ministers to individualize their hearers more, they would feel a deeper interest in their salvation. They would labor more intensely to awaken their minds to the great truths of religion. We have read of one who wrote out the names of his congregation, hung the record up in his closet, and there poured out his prayers in behalf of each, adapting his supplications to their individual circumstances. Here was great interest and great zeal, and, it is scarcely necessary to add, great success. We do not say that the same course

should be adopted by all ; but the fact stated, is indicative alike of zeal for souls, and of success in special efforts for their salvation.

We have thought, in this connection, of the remark which John Foster makes in reference to the utmost possibilities of prayer, and cannot forbear giving it a more enlarged application. He states hypothetically, if we recollect, that persevering prayer for spiritual blessings, if tested as to its utmost stretch of influence, might accomplish such wonders in the moral world as would utterly outrun the most enlarged expectations of the strongest faith. And here we may ask, by way of giving Foster's remark a personal bearing, if any Christian or Christian minister has ever tried the last and largest result of importunate supplication ? Has the prayer been with such intensity of desire, such a tenacious grasp of the promises, such a persevering waiting upon God, as in our circumstances, and in view of the importance of the object, might be put forth ? *Till* this is done, we cannot say what God might not do. We cannot say, that such prayer might not draw down the converting influence upon the most hardened wretch in the community. We are not sure, that in answer to it, the proudest heart, though inaccessible almost to Christian influence, though environed by all the effeminating and polluting influences of sensuality, might not be broken down into penitence. Who could tell but that powerful revivals might follow such prayers, or who might not predict, that with lightning-like speed, the kingdom of our Emanuel would be seen advancing to its ultimate triumphs !

These are animating thoughts ; but if, keeping in view Foster's idea of the possibilities of prayer, we connect with them the possibilities of effort as conjoined with prayer, we shall feel a still heavier responsibility in our work.

It becomes us then to put the question, as to what results might follow the utmost possibilities of effort in behalf of souls. In order to perceive the bearings of this question, we must individualize our hearers. We must ask ourselves, if every thing has been done, which could be done consistently, to save each soul committed to our charge ; whether we have studied the character of each, so as to fit the truth to its tone and tendencies ; whether we have learned its prejudices with a view of removing them ; and whether efforts adapted to their removal have actually been made ; whether

we have come into sufficiently close contact with each, and by the manifestation of a personal interest, removed that barrier to free communion which is often felt between a pastor and many of his people? Have we patiently plied each soul with the truth of God, adapting it to the shifting protean forms of their objections? If repulsed or unsuccessful, have we returned after much prayer to commune with the object of our solicitude? Have we watched for, and improved every recurring opportunity to do the sinner good; and have even our ordinary social and business transactions with him been such as to pave the way for the introduction of more important themes?

All this may have been done with respect to some who are easy of access; or in whom from various causes, we may have felt a very special interest; but the grand question to one who has a multitude of souls under his care; the question that must fall upon *his* conscience is, have these efforts been made for all? Have we been thus interested for those who stand farthest off, who are most shy of our attacks; or who, by character and circumstances, are reached with greater difficulty; have the possibilities of effort been tried upon them? One soul is as valuable as another; nor can we say, what might have been through God effected if we had tried upon all the utmost possibilities of effort. Our love of ease, our fear of man, our natural timidity, our reluctance to practise self-denial may secretly have imposed on our judgment—may even have bribed our conscience into acquiescence of our unfaithfulness—but if we cannot say, what would have been the result of the last possible effort for the sinner's salvation, we are not sure that his blood is not reeking in our guilty skirts. Who dare say that if, breaking through every obstacle, we were to strive in every possible way to save each soul committed to us, we should not become the instrument of its salvation!

The further we proceed in these suppositions, the more overwhelming seems our responsibility. Far be it from us to attribute to *man*, what properly belongs to God; or to suppose that *means* without the accompanying power of the Holy Spirit can avail to awaken the dead in sin; but when we discover that efforts, made in correspondence with his commands and with the sinner's circumstances, have been blessed, and sometimes unexpectedly blessed; when it is even *not certain that these efforts will be made in vain*, there

comes down upon us a tremendous pressure of obligation to *try* them. Then if we allow self-indulgence to say to us, you cannot reach that sinner, when access is barely possible, we may well tremble at our position. If we allow his forbidding frown, or his known hostility to the truth, or his high and influential station; if we suffer any or all of these to be an impassable barrier to exertion; if, on *these grounds* we give him up, or only ply him with the arrows of truth, at a cold and professional distance, we may come near to the guilt of being accessory to his eternal ruin. Here is a point, whose bearing on our success is as important as its bearing on our responsibility is dreadful. Shall we suffer any sophistry to break its full force upon our consciences? Shall we allow the indefiniteness of what duty in all these respects is, to undermine our moral energy, or to deflect our vision from the overwhelming account which we are soon to render for the care of souls? If we have not looked over our charge with an intense longing for the salvation of each individual; if we rest satisfied with fidelity in the pulpit; if we allow interviews with the sinner to occur without an effort to save him; if we are discouraged by obstacles, or listen to the plea of indolence and timidity, we are not the faithful watchmen we profess to be. We are preparing terrible work for a *dying hour*. But if, on the other hand, we are awake to the import of our commission, and striving by every possible effort to interest sinners in the message of salvation, discriminating and pungent in our appeals from the pulpit—tender but faithful in our private interviews with souls—watchful of every opportunity to do them good, and hastening to improve it; if nothing that the gospel commands or justifies as a means of salvation be left untried; if all is done that *can* be done, and done relying on God alone—then if the sinner dies and drops into hell, he will have none to blame but himself, or at least *we* shall be guiltless of his blood. Awful is our responsibility! We are to our hearers “the savor of life unto life or of death unto death.” Under our ministry, some are to be roused from their slumbers, and others lulled into a more fatal security. Some are to lay down the weapons of their rebellion, and others to clench them with a more unyielding grasp. Some will ripen for heaven, and others rush on more madly to hell. Some will cavil and criticise, until pride of opinion combining with obstinacy of heart, will prepare them to re-

ject all religion and die in the darkness of infidelity. Others will come to mock, but remain to pray, and meet us at last in heaven. Thirty years—if our labors be extended to that period—will present us with a new congregation. Ears that were wont to listen to us will be cold in death. We shall have handed one generation of hearers over to the tribunal of God. One after another they will have fallen. From the pulpit we shall be called to close their dying eyes. The question is well nigh as solemn to us as to them, How have they been instructed? What sentiments have we inculcated? What hopes encouraged? As they turn upon us their glazed eye—its glance rendered the more penetrating by the anxiety of the departing moment—how shall we feel, and what will our consciences say, when they seem to implore our last effort in their behalf? Suppose them impatient. Have we taught them the whole truth of God? Have we shown a personal interest in their salvation? Have we followed them to their retirement with our warnings? Have we prayed over them with that intensity of desire which their perilous condition demands? Have we left no means untried to rouse them to a sense of their guilt and danger? Can we say, as they lie gasping in death, not one drop of their blood will be found in our skirts; nor an upbraiding look from them be flung upon us at the judgment bar?

It is in vain for us to think of escaping from these inquiries. Nor can we atone for the neglect of souls by assiduities at the death-bed. 'Tis not the place for us to labor. We can as little hope to *do* good as *they* to *obtain* it. All *then* is alarm and agitation. Every thing is rushing to a fearful crisis. The soul is struggling in its tremendous passageway to eternity. If the work have not been done *before*, it is almost hopeless that it will be done *then*. No: the question is, whether, whilst we have the soul under our influence, within reach of our efforts, we have done all we could to save it. What verdict will conscience pronounce on this point? Have we taken leave of no soul at the threshold of eternity, in whose case something seems to whisper, "It has sunk to hell; it is gone, irrecoverably gone; it is among the everlasting burnings!" The thought even is dreadful. But how much more dreadful when conscience mutters, "Yes, it *is* gone, and *you* are to blame. You should have prayed more for its salvation—shown a deeper interest in its welfare—labored more industriously to save it. You

were too indifferent whilst it was within reach of mercy. But now it is gone. Your note of warning cannot reach it now. Your next interview with it will be at the bar of God."

Or suppose the soul departing in the exercise of a hope. It looks upon you from the couch of death, with an inquiring eye, as if to ask you, "Is my hope such as I may depend on?" The answer involves an overwhelming responsibility. It was you who encouraged that hope. It was your instructions which led to its adoption. The anxious inquiring soul came to you in the hour of its trial. To your ear was the question addressed, "What shall I do?" The soul caught up your discourse, and followed your counsel. You have had its training, and now, in the awful moment when soul and body are separating, it appeals to you, if the hope which it indulges will stand the dreadful shock.

Suppose, by error in doctrine, or by deluding methods in practice, we have encouraged a false hope; suppose, instead of faith in Christ, it be but the fitful excitement of fancy—the resolution of the creature, rather than the regenerating influence of the Spirit—how shall we feel to send that soul into eternity, soothed by assurances, which will only aggravate the horrors of its disappointment!

The commission which we have received will soon be recalled. Our work will soon be done—the last sermon preached—the last spiritual office performed. Then must we too encounter the dying struggle. How have we discharged our ministerial functions? will then be the all-absorbing question. It will be forgotten, how much we were esteemed as eloquent preachers, or able divines, except as these items go to swell the weight of our responsibility. It will not soothe our dying reflections to think, what a conspicuous part we have played on the theatre of controversial strife. Ah no; ecclesiastical pre-eminence will then look small. The grand and startling question will be, How have we acquitted ourselves as the appointed watchmen of souls? To have brought one soul to Jesus, will be more refreshing in death, than to have worn academic honors, or to have elicited by our eloquence the deep murmurs of applause. To have educated the humble for their stations in heaven will then seem a more grateful task, than to have shone amid the great lights of the age, for the extent of our erudition, or for the unanswerable power of our logic. To a

dying minister, how contemptible a thing is fame! And when his tongue is silent in the grave—when it can no more speak forth its awful message, how soon do his name and his memory fade from the earth! But oh, his account at God's tribunal, how overwhelming! Others must answer for themselves alone. *He* must not only lay open his own soul beneath the light of the judgment—have its motives searched and its hopes sifted—he must not only pass this perilous account for himself, but he must stand an examination for his fidelity to hundreds. Souls will meet him there who once sat under his ministry, watched his conduct, and listened to his appeals. There his doctrine will be scrutinized. Did he preach the truth? was it the *whole* truth? Did neither the fear of man, nor the love of popular applause operate to blunt its keen edge? Was he faithful out of the pulpit? did he follow the sinner in every walk of life with his prayers and his entreaties? Were his life and doctrines coincident? Was he ambitious? was he mercenary? Did he do all from love to Christ and souls? As these questions roll on his ear, along will come the witnesses to reply. *There* will be seen lost souls. Were they lost under his ministry, and through *his* unfaithfulness? The wailings of the damned will say yes or no. *There* will be seen the hypocrite glaring through the flames of hell, to testify whether he was brought thither for want of one to deal faithfully with his soul; there, too, the mournfully stricken object of despair, who built a hope of heaven on fallacious grounds;—and one unutterable look of anguish will say if the minister was to blame. Who can anticipate such scenes, and not feel that the ministry is a work of fearful responsibility?

ART. VII.—NEGLECT OF THE CLASSICS IN THE LITERARY
INSTITUTIONS OF THIS COUNTRY.

No. I.

By the Editor.

WE deem it superfluous to enter upon a vindication of the importance of the ancient Greek and Latin Classics. Aside from the fact, that they are the only sources of ancient history, philosophy and science, it is well known that

they have always been the models to all who have aimed at excellence of style or skill in various departments of literary effort. Those who have been the most distinguished for original genius, have been the most enamored of these highest specimens of it, and most assiduous in their efforts to form themselves upon them. Almost every distinguished literary character of ancient and modern times has given his testimony in their favor. An intimate acquaintance with the poetry, eloquence, history and philosophy of Greece and Rome, have always been considered as an essential part of a polite education. It is notorious, that most of the literary institutions of Europe have assigned to the Classics at least one half of the time devoted to the acquisition of a learned education. The learning and wisdom of our fathers assigned them a place of equal honor in our own institutions, and custom still deigns to continue this place to them.

But the honor which they receive in the literary institutions of this country is exceedingly hollow and unsubstantial. There is a great, and, we apprehend, an increasing neglect of them. Being pursued in a superficial and inaccurate manner, the student is not able either to understand or to relish them, and not continuing his course till he is mostly freed from the drudgery of constant recurrence to grammars and dictionaries, he almost uniformly becomes heartily sick of them, and throws them aside in disgust as soon as he is freed from the restraints of his college course.

That they are very generally and very greatly neglected is notorious. No one, who has graduated at any college* in New-England or New-York within the last twenty years, can have a doubt on this subject. It is notorious, that very few students become sufficiently acquainted with the Latin and Greek to read them with ease and fluency. We have heard it variously estimated, by some that not one in twenty, by others, that not one in fifty continue their acquaintance with the classics after leaving college. There can be little doubt, that the number of classical scholars who are formed at our colleges, bears no great proportion to those who derive no important benefit from this very large portion of their literary education.

Perhaps the clerical profession, more than either of the others, gives leisure to its members for the pursuit of general

* We regard Columbia College of this city as a marked exception to our observations, as respect the diligence and accuracy with which classical literature is pursued.

literature. But how seldom is one found, who has built on the foundation which he laid in college, and become to any extent imbued with the literature of Greece and Rome! Look into the libraries of professional men, and so far from seeing there a choice collection of the best classic writers, you will hardly find the few Greek and Latin books which they used at school. Except a few school books, there is but a very limited sale for such works in this country.

Of what use is it to study the Greek and Latin four years and then lay them aside for ever? It may be said, that they furnish a useful exercise to the memory; but why labor so long to amass such a treasure, and then suffer it to perish? It may be said, they furnish a useful discipline to the mind. But what kind of discipline is that, where all the mental labor is but negligently and superficially performed? It may be said, that the student becomes acquainted with a few of the master-pieces of antiquity. But if this acquaintance with such works were intimate and accurate, it would almost uniformly be continued and extended. The truth is, that as these studies are now conducted in most of our colleges, one half of the time allowed for education is absolutely thrown away.

We do not wish, in stating these facts, to cast the blame upon those who conduct the studies in our collegiate institutions, though we do not consider them as altogether undeserving of censure. One cause indeed of the evils we have noticed, is that too little time is devoted to a preparation for college. It is perfectly feasible that the student should, previous to admission, be able to read the best Latin and Greek authors with some degree of facility. There is certainly time for this between the ages of ten and fifteen. But the main reason is, the superficial manner in which students are taught during their preparatory course, and which the colleges, owing to the spirit of rivalry for numbers, have been induced to sanction. From the great majority of preparatory institutions, they receive young men with inveterate habits of superficial and inaccurate study, and the most that can be hoped from a more thorough course, is the unlearning of what has been acquired. We believe that not a few of the instructors in the colleges of this country would prefer to receive some of their pupils total strangers to Greek and Latin, rather than undertake any thing with them in the condition in which they actually come into their hands. The

instructors in our public seminaries have not been ignorant of this evil ; their fault has been silence. Doubtless the mischief cannot be corrected by any individual institution, so far even as itself is concerned. But it is a subject far too serious to be passed over in silence ; it calls for mutual consultation, for co-operation, and even combination in the higher institutions. When the evil is made known ; when it is generally understood that no preparatory school can, after abusing in the grossest manner their trust in respect to their pupils, force them off upon colleges ambitious of swelling their numbers or dreading desertion ; when it is known that there will be no admission of such into any respectable institution, the thing must cease.

We feel confident that we are warranted in our assertion, that the time spent upon the Latin and Greek languages, as they are generally studied in this country, is absolutely thrown away ; that about one half of the labor, time and expense spent upon those who are forming for the learned professions is absolutely squandered. But we feel that we are warranted in going further : nothing is more sure to disgust the mind with all literary efforts than a superficial method of study. How deep and confirmed will be this dislike when it has been taking root and receiving growth through full one half (and that the decisive part) of the student's course ! Where the pupil has commenced by committing his grammar to his memory, and engraves it there by constantly writing and parsing the language ; where he does not hurry to a new lesson in reading till the last has been made his own by very numerous repetitions, his course is soon pleasant. By a manly facing of difficulties which must be met, they soon vanish, there is a pleasure in conquering them. It gives exercise and vigor to the memory and judgment. His course he finds every day more easy and rapid. He is conscious that he is advancing with accelerated velocity, and that all the obstacles to his progress will soon be removed. But the reverse is true on the modern fashionable labor-saving schemes of study. The student finds no mitigation of his labors. He is relieved indeed from the task, as it is considered, of employing his memory and judgment in applying the rules of grammar, but he can look forward only to the drudgery of turning over his dictionary without being conscious of any increased rapidity or ease in his advances. He has not the satisfaction of being enga-

ged in any process which requires the exercise of judgment in the application of rules, definitions or exceptions; he is barely loading his memory with a useless burden of words. He can make out the signification of a single word, but must guess at the meaning of a sentence. He advances too slow to derive any pleasure from his author; indeed he cannot sufficiently understand him to be interested in his subject, much less to discover any of the beauties or excellencies of the composition. We have no hesitation in saying that the fashionable, and as we believe general method, of studying the learned languages, under pretence of saving the student from the labor of exercising his memory and judgment, condemns him to the most degrading and servile drudgery to which a human being can be subjected. It not only produces a thorough disgust towards the classics, but is almost sure, from its long continuance in the decisive portion of the student's life, to be extended to every other pursuit.

We regard the habit of listless and superficial study acquired and confirmed by four years' practice as almost unconquerable. One most important object of the student's training is to accustom him to the severe, systematic and manly exertion of his powers. It will generally be found that real fondness for literary labor is acquired in no other way. He who has been taught by long practice to encounter difficulties, to surmount obstacles, and to delight in high efforts, acquires a consciousness of power and a firmness and hardiness of literary character, which will ensure industry and success in all his future pursuits. The person who possesses these habits of industry, and this fondness for high mental effort, has a more valuable treasure than he who has large stores of knowledge without it. What then shall we say of the accomplishments of that young man who has spent his first four years, those which actually fix the character, and has acquired only a dread of all high and systematic effort, together with habits of superficial and inaccurate study? It is almost certain that these habits will follow him to his other pursuits. It will require efforts to which he is both unaccustomed and averse, to correct them, and as they have made one half of his literary course of little value, they are almost sure to have a pernicious influence over the remainder.

We are aware that the classics are more studied than formerly. But it is chiefly by those who have finished their collegiate course. There is a growing belief of their im-

portance, and those who have completed their studies without much attention to that which is the most essential part of the course, are beginning very generally to become sensible of their mistake; and it may be said with much truth of most of those who in this country have enjoyed a public education, and arrived at any eminence, that they have found it necessary to lay again the foundations of their education, and may justly lay claim to the popular distinction of self-made men.

We have time at present to trace the evil no further than it affects individuals. It would be an important task to point out the influence of our superficial system of education upon the community. Doubtless we suffer a great variety of evils from the fact, that we have scarce any persons who are highly qualified to direct the taste of the community in literature, and guide their opinions on the great subjects of public interest which are constantly agitating it. We have, indeed, individuals who may put in their claims to be considered learned, literary and scientific, but they are far from being numerous enough to be reckoned as a distinct class of the community. We produce scarce a tithe of our proportion of valuable works of taste and genius, and hardly any original works of science. A variety of causes have some agency in this, but the one which has incomparably the most influence, is the notorious fact, that our colleges do not give an education which can be compared with that bestowed by the universities of Europe; they do not give what would there be termed a liberal and polite education.

But nothing is wanting to put them on a footing at least similar, but that the majority of our preparatory schools should be compelled, by the united influence of the colleges, to imitate the example of a very respectable minority, that the languages be studied thoroughly, and the course be considerably extended. Then students might enter the higher seminaries, prepared and disposed fully to avail themselves of the treasures which the public munificence has amassed for their benefit.

But the present superficial mode of studying the classics will soon supply argument to a very numerous and influential class, who would gladly persuade the public that they are of no use. Should our utilitarians and radicals see fit to continue their attacks upon this part of a public education, we may fear that few will be prepared from conviction to

defend it: the community will perhaps be induced to throw off the shackles of custom, to declare its independence of the opinions of the learned, polite and refined, in all past ages; and our colleges, like the Goths and Vandals of Oberlin, will be ready to make a bonfire of the masterpieces of ancient genius.

But as we take for granted that the present system may yet be permitted to continue for some time at least, out of regard to the popular utilitarian principles of economy, the writer of the next article will attempt to prove that the only way of mastering the languages is by thorough and accurate study: and that the fashionable superficial course is the very worst possible economy, both of time and labor.

ART. VIII.—THAT THE THOROUGH IS THE ONLY ECONOMICAL METHOD OF STUDYING THE CLASSICS.

No. II.

By **TAYLER LEWIS**, Prof. of Greek and Latin in the University of New York.

IN discussing the subject of the present article it is not intended to enter at all upon any argument to prove the great importance of classical literature, or to declaim against its gross neglect in most of our literary institutions. The first position we take for granted throughout. No proof is required for those who are capable of appreciating its claims; who have drank deep at this never-failing fountain of primitive thought, or who have truly, and without the affectation of pedantry, acquired a taste for that sublime power of words, which is nowhere so exhibited as in the Greek and Roman classics. All the clamors of a superficial and falsely styled utilitarian age could never drive such from the deep conviction, that in them are contained the purest and clearest forms of thought, the richest models of diction, the sweetest poetry, the most soul-stirring eloquence, and the most deep and lofty philosophy; that their early study furnishes the mind's noblest exercise, and their constant perusal through life, the most refined and soul-satisfying delight. The gross neglect of classical literature among us, is also assumed as a fact, well known and admitted, although with cheering indications that the exertions of certain ardent and indefatigable scholars, have al-

ready been instrumental in producing some change in the public sentiment, and a growing conviction, that a knowledge of the early history of our world with its primitive languages and institutions forms the best foundation for all accurate views in morals, theology, politics and philosophy.

Waiving these matters, or assuming them as true, we would direct our attention to an objection to the study of the ancient languages, the most formidable that is ever presented: an objection formidable in consequence of being derived, not from any deficiency in the intrinsic claims of the classics themselves, but from admitted and undeniable facts in relation to the mode in which they are studied. The objector with all honesty, and with a force which cannot well be parried, will tell us of the vast increase in the amount of physical science, which now necessarily forms a part of every course of liberal education, and of the diminution of the time which (as a necessary consequence) can now be devoted to classical studies. He will tell us of the number of years which are squandered in these apparently useless pursuits. He points to the results which are the miserable fruits of this wholesale waste of time. He appeals to the thousands who are yearly poured forth from our academies and colleges, of whom he can safely say, that not one in a hundred, after their graduation, ever open a classic author, or regard the poor acquisitions they may have made, as having any bearing upon their subsequent business or professional pursuits. He will point to the liberally educated lawyer or physician, to whom, in a very few years, Cicero, Quintillian and Hippocrates, are books as sealed and mysterious as the hieroglyphics sculptured on an Egyptian temple; or to the clergymen, whose Hebrew Bible and Greek Testament lie in dust upon their shelves, with a few pages slightly soiled of the first chapters in Genesis, or the beginning of the Gospel of John, the mere memorials of wasted time, and misspent opportunities, for the acquisition of more useful and practical knowledge. He brings to his aid admissions (as they are styled) of those who have received a classical education, testifying to its utter worthlessness. He challenges a contradiction of his facts, and clamorously demands reform — His argument is plausible. Without some change in the admitted state of things, it is unanswerable. Reform is imperiously required. Nine or ten years of the most valuable portion of life is too much to be thrown away on a course

which produces no higher results than these. The genuine lover of the literature of antiquity is not however so readily inclined to yield his favorite branches, without at least some struggle for their maintenance. Admitting the plausibility and apparent strength of the objection, and deeply regretting the state of things which gives it all its force, he still contends that this reform should be manifested, not in striking the classics from our courses of education, but in arousing the attention of teachers and taught to the importance of a more thorough, accurate, and (as a necessary consequence) more economical and expeditious plan of study.

It is to this point, waiving for the present all other considerations, that we would direct our undivided attention. That mode of studying the Greek and Latin languages which shall be the most thorough, and in connection with this the most economical of time, is the great desideratum in all our literary institutions. It may be said that such modes have already been devised in abundance, and that their multiplicity is one of the peculiar characteristics of the present day. We have the Hamiltonian system. We have inter-linear translations, most aptly styled, for their surprising expedition in conveying the student *over* his course at the least expense of thought and memory, the rail-road classics. We have every year new grammars in great profusion, each professing to be called out by the pressing wants of this rapidly advancing age, and holding out the promise of speedy acquisition, by relieving the young mind from the slavish drudgery and parrot-like memoriter toil of more ancient and exploded systems. Such grammars and school books as formed the classical scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, are ill adapted to the present growing demand, and increased relish for classical literature in these United States. But the subject is too serious for irony. By their fruits ye shall know them. When our improved systems of education, and our elementary school books are found to produce such scholars as Usher, Cudworth, Warburton and others, who were but a few out of many in an age distinguished for sound learning and classical research, then, and not till then, may we boast of our superiority. Then may American theologians be justified in speaking of Calvin as a good scholar, considering the age in which he lived. Then, and not till then, shall we do away the re-

proach of professing every thing and doing nothing; of ever beginning and never accomplishing; of ever making a flourish about the vestibule of classic knowledge, and never leading the student to the rich treasures contained within its reverend temple.

These are not the modes for obtaining the grand object which is so much to be desired, and which we would wish to keep constantly in view, as the single and leading thought of the present article; viz. that method of studying the Greek and Latin languages which shall be the most thorough, and in connection with this the most economical of time. This end we apprehend is only to be attained, by a very different course from those alluded to, and by ceasing to propose it to the student's mind as the great and primary object of pursuit. Paradoxical as it may seem, the assertion can be sustained, that the very object is defeated by the hurry and impatience (to say nothing of the superficial scholarship) which have been at the bottom of all these labor-saving courses of study, and short cuts to knowledge. The student is allured by the hopes of a pleasant and easy course; pleasant only, because it is in the beginning free from all those difficulties which meet him with accumulated force, and often totally discourage him in a more advanced state of his progress; easy, because he is carried along at first with the least expense of toilsome thought, and with the least exercise of that faculty which is the grand supply of life and vigor to every other power of the soul, the memory.* Even

* Almost all our new systems of education make a great merit of saving the memory, as though they would prevent its injury by over exercise. The opposite mode of instruction has been stigmatized as "learning by rote," parrot-like, &c. The analytical plan, as it is styled, is recommended as more philosophical, more free from slavish submission to authority, more favorable to the development and independence of thought and the cultivation of the mind's own native powers; as though the philosophy of a thing could be acquired before the thing itself was known, or the mind could exercise its own powers until it possessed substantial subjects of thought clothed in "good forms of sound words," and treasured up in a clear, retentive and well exercised memory. It is this which has given rise to our mental arithmetics, our inductive systems of English Grammar, the substitution of the more easy plan of questions and answers for the former method of synthetical rules, and of an undigested mass of Sabbath school books in the place of the old concise and logical catechisms. The writer was for years engaged in elementary instruction, and during that period had experience enough of the systems which have been mentioned. Misled by their plausible pretensions, he was once to some extent induced to adopt them. Actual trial, however,

could this encouragement be legitimately used, and without detriment to the student's future scholarship, there is another of a higher kind and of more powerful and permanent effects. It is that stimulus which arises from his being frankly told of the difficulties which lie in his way, provided it be accompanied by the cheering assurance, that those difficulties are not insurmountable; that in due season, if he faint not, he will reap a rich harvest as a reward for all his diligence. It is one which is connected with no chilling disappointment. Under its influence, he will find difficulties continually vanishing in his advancing progress, and his path becoming more and more clear, and free from those intricacies with which he must sooner or later become entangled, in the more easy and labor-saving methods. There is connected with this a higher stimulus still, viz. the exquisite delight of accurate knowledge, however limited, which has been the fruit of clear and minute instruction and patient toil; a stimulus which, instead of wearing out and losing its charm like the one first mentioned, is continually increasing and gathering strength from every acquisition to which it has given rise.

Herein we conceive lies the grand secret of education. The fear of punishment or disgrace soon loses its effect, and the minds which need it are those of which we can have the least hope. The excitement of emulation or rivalry seems morally wrong, and must be condemned as an appeal to a passion which needs rather to be checked than encouraged. Inducements founded upon the idea that the acquisition of knowledge is easy, and attempts to render it so by removing its necessary asperities, are soon found to be delusive, and productive only of mental indolence or disappointed

soon convinced him of their worthlessness, both in scientific and religious instruction. An apparently rapid progress at first is soon found to be utterly barren of any permanent results. Like water poured into a sieve, instruction, attempted to be conveyed to the mind without precise synthetical rules and the rigid discipline of the memory, soon vanishes away, leaving scarcely a trace behind. Good rules or logical formulas may be regarded as repositories in the mind, framed for the reception and retention of thought. In this age of *things* there is nothing so much in danger of being overlooked as the importance of good forms of sound *words*, and there is reason to apprehend that the process may go on until the relations of *things* can neither be properly classified, expressed, or even conceived in the mind, and science, losing its meaning, become merely the confused knowledge of individual objects. There is no greater enemy (I am satisfied) to the cause of education in this country than the almost universal preference of the systems to which allusion has been made.

hopes. But the delight of accurate knowledge, the charming sensation which accompanies the consciousness of knowing any thing well, be it in the higher or more humble departments of science, is the surest guaranty of increasing and persevering efforts for still farther acquisitions. And this is a stimulus under the influence of which almost every subject may be brought, and of which every faithful teacher may avail himself. Only let great pains be taken, and much patience exercised, that the first lessons be most thoroughly and completely learned, even to the minutest particulars; that no difficulty of the smallest kind be left in the way, as a perplexing impediment in some future portion of the course; only let this be effectually secured, and the student, under the glowing delight of conscious accurate knowledge, and the encouraging feeling that this has been the result of the toilsome exercise of his own powers, will proceed with eager relish to his subsequent task; a relish which will be increased at every step, provided this regimen is rigidly adhered to. I have sometimes thought that the thorough acquisition in this way of *all* the forms of the Greek nouns and adjectives together with the accents, quantity, and rules of inflection, would almost infallibly secure a satisfactory acquaintance with the whole range of Greek literature. We need not contrast with this the painful emotions which arise from confused and inaccurate knowledge. With thousands the vivid recollection of the discouraging perplexities which may be traced to this cause, constitute about the only remembrance of their academic or collegiate course.

It is high time the secret should be disclosed, that notwithstanding our Hamiltonian and Pestalozzi schemes, notwithstanding our productive and inductive systems, and all the new inventions and quackery of the day, there is, after all, no great mystery in the art of teaching. Mistakes arise from overlooking the simplicity and singleness of the object. It is nothing more than conveying to one mind what exists clearly in another, with this difference, that the teacher is supposed to see the results and to understand the philosophy of the process, whilst the student must of necessity be taught to take his first lessons as matters of *authority* and *memory*, antecedent to, and affording a foundation for, a subsequent exercise of the reason. According to this view, the qualifications of a good teacher may be briefly defined to be these: 1st, a thorough understanding of the science he professes to

teach ; 2d, unwearied patience, ever resisting the temptation to suffer his pupils to proceed to a second lesson until they have completely mastered the first ; and, 3d, an unyielding determination to make perfect accuracy the first thing, and second thing, and third thing, in every course of education, and every department of science.

These thoughts may be regarded as almost truisms. They are nowever none the less important on that account. Truisms are often the most valuable species of knowledge, although liable to be overlooked, in consequence of their simplicity and apparent want of originality. But how, it may be asked, does this supply the grand desideratum ? If the saving of time, or the prevention of its useless waste, be the object proposed, how is this to be effected by a method based upon a slower progress, and more minute instruction ? The answer to these questions brings us again to that single position which we desire to maintain. It is an old proverb, that a good beginning is more than half the work. It is at least as old as the time of Sophocles :

Εργον δε παντος ην τις αρχηται καλως
Και τας τελευτας εικος εαυ αυτως εχειν,

and the experience of succeeding ages has not in the least diminished its authority. There is another equally significant, that there is no so great a waster of time as hurry. Could the writer only succeed in impressing the importance of this simple dogma of common sense, he would be very willing, for the sake of it, to forfeit all claim to originality, and submit to the imputation of reiterating self-evident truisms.

It is a fact which cannot be denied, that the course of classical instruction in most of our seminaries of learning is useless, and worse than useless, in consequence of the impatient and loose manner in which it is pursued. The issue then should be distinctly presented, and fairly met. Shall the study of the Greek and Latin languages be at once abandoned, or some system adopted which shall be productive of results corresponding not only to the importance of these branches, but to the time employed in their acquisition ? Better yield them by a manly acquiescence in the popular objection, than persevere in that wretched system which seems merely an accommodation to antiquated usages, whilst it evidently betrays a lurking distrust of their utility, and is constantly adding strength to the arguments of opposers. Before however being guilty of this Vandalic act, it would be

worth our while to make a serious trial of some better way. Let the old plan of exercising the memory be revived, if for no other purpose than thereby to give strength and clearness to all the other faculties of the mind. Let elementary grammars be selected, full, yet concise, expressed with all that logical accuracy for which the older works of the kind were distinguished, giving results alone, instead of perplexing the student's mind at the outset with pedantic theories of a language of which as yet he knows nothing. When he has learned by authority the structure of the language as an existing thing, a good foundation will be laid for subsequent instruction in relation to its origin and philosophy. Of grammars thus selected, let the whole, and not merely detached parts, be thoroughly committed to memory, and repeated, until the forms, inflections, rules and idioms, with their various modifications and exceptions, are stereotyped in the mind, and without any further effort of memory arise habitually and spontaneously to the thoughts. All this, to be sure, requires no great skill, and puts in no claim to originality ; but it requires patience and perseverance, and with these qualities, this indispensable work *may* be accomplished. Let this be accompanied by constant exercise, in writing, accenting and pronouncing, together with the reading and parsing of such examples as may most effectually familiarize the rules and forms which have been learned, until the grammar, the soul or substantial part of the language, has been completely mastered, and the subsequent acquisition of words will be both easy and pleasant. In vain, on any other plan, will the lexicon be worn out in an endless repetition of the same wearisome and unsatisfactory exercise. Words will be easily remembered and rapidly acquired, when the grammatical frame-work has been prepared in the mind for their reception. To expect it on any other system is as absurd as the attempt to build a wall without cement, composed only of loose pebbles or grains of sand. Let half a year, if necessary, (although this length of time will seldom be required,) be employed in this grammatical exercise. Six months thus occupied will save treble that amount of time in a subsequent part of his course, or rather will prevent the whole from being utterly wasted. The estimate, however, is based upon the supposition that no other studies are pursued in connection with the languages ; otherwise a much longer period would be required. Let a second year be spent in the

slow and cautious reading of some *pure* Latin author, with continual parsing of every word; the study and constant repetition of the grammar being still regarded as the primary object. During this period the student should be regularly exercised in writing the language, and in making double translations from Latin to English, and from English to Latin; also in construing in this double manner from the voice of his teacher, and with the book closed; proceeding from single words to complete sentences, until the thought comes to his mind in the Latin order, and the full power of a Latin sentence is felt as an inseparable whole. This, as we said before, requires patience, but with patience it *can* be done; and when the course is fairly commenced, and thoroughly persevered in, the rapidity of the actual progress may be found to exceed the teacher's most sanguine expectations. By *actual progress* we mean not the amount of apparent space passed over during the first year, but the real degree of satisfactory insight into the nature and structure of the language. Let the student also, during this time, be supplied with convenient blank books, containing well written forms of all the declinable parts of speech, together with all the rules of syntax, and let him be required to inscribe, under their appropriate heads, every new form and construction he may meet with at each recitation. The commencement of the third six months, (allowing the fullest extension of time,) will find the scholar thus exercised possessed of far more substantial knowledge of the language, than one who has hurried over far more ground, and apparently made much more rapid progress. His subsequent course may then be *continual reading*, in which he may be pushed to his full speed, and carried forward with as much rapidity as the encouragements of his teacher, his own well acquired habits of diligence, and the exquisite delight of accurate knowledge can ensure.* Henceforth he will have before him an unembarrassed field of enjoyment, which will supersede the necessity of any other stimulus. The grand object will have been

* As an illustration and proof of this position, the fact may be mentioned, that in a school conducted upon this plan, during the period in which one class were diligently occupied with the first two hundred lines of the *Æneid*, another scholar, who had previously gone through a similar process, read with accuracy the whole of Herodotus, four select orations of Demosthenes, and fifteen books of the *Odyssey*, together with an almost equal quantity of Latin.

attained. His subsequent perseverance, and attachment through life to classical literature will have been secured. Henceforth his progress will be measured, not by the scanty and oft-times ill-selected fragments which are found in our ordinary school books, each one presenting only a renewal of the same difficulties, but by the entire reading of some of the best Greek and Latin authors. I have no doubt that, by rigidly pursuing this course with both languages, the six principal Roman and Grecian historians, their best orators, and a large share of their epic and dramatic poetry might be read in less time than is frequently occupied in preparing for college. Like the mechanical law of the accumulation of forces, there would be in such a course a continual acceleration of velocity, rapid in proportion to the first slow and cautious progress, and more than exceeding the ratio of the square of the times and distances passed over.

Classes thus prepared in the academy or primary schools will enter upon their collegiate course, far in advance of those who ordinarily graduate from our higher institutions; and instead of occupying the professor with the details of the grammar school, will allow him to perform, what should ever be his legitimate duties, viz. in a continued series of lectures to improve himself, and to direct the minds of his classes to the higher departments of classical literature; to discuss the philosophy of the ancient languages; to point out the rich stores of metaphysical thought, which are contained in primitive terms; to examine the critical excellencies of the ancient writers; to dwell upon the sublimity of the primitive philosophy; and to disclose to well prepared and delighted auditors the never fading beauties of the world's earliest poetry.

These, we say, should be reserved for the collegiate course, or at least for its higher classes. They cannot be realized in the earlier period, whilst the mind is occupied with the drudgery of grammars and lexicons. During this time all that is said about the beauties of the classic authors, must appear unmeaning pedantry, unless the student is led to repose habitual confidence in the encouraging declarations of his teacher, that as a recompense for patient toil and accurate investigation, there is in reserve for him a rich and inexhaustible mine of the most refined enjoyment.

It is painful to contemplate the results of an opposite process, although the disheartening picture is every where pre-

sented to our view. The victim of a loose and hurried preparation for college is carried rapidly through his grammar. The forms of the language are imperfectly committed to memory. The lessons of the one day, for the want of constant repetition, are forgotten before those of the next are acquired. The more minute rules and exceptions, the very parts which require the most careful attention, are postponed to other periods, and the student is told that he can most effectually acquire them as matters of observation in his subsequent reading. In vain has the experience of scholars and teachers demonstrated that these subsequent periods seldom if ever arrive. The temptation to save a small amount of present time and labor, although it may be at the expense of far greater waste and embarrassment in future, is in most cases too powerful to be resisted. No fact is more conclusively established, than that those more minute parts of the language, which are neglected at the beginning of the course, are seldom thoroughly mastered; and that in the few cases in which this is accomplished, it is at a sacrifice of far more toil and time, than would have been required in the introductory grammatical exercises. We have called them minute parts, but the term is only used relatively. In themselves they are of the highest importance, and often a knowledge of them is more conducive to a satisfactory acquaintance with the language, than of others which are seemingly of much more value. We mean (for example) the rules which relate to accents, quantity, gender, contractions, the uses of the conjunctions and adverbs, the exceptions to the rules of formation and syntax, with their various modifications. These may be compared to the joinings and braces, whose skillful location is often of more importance to the stability of the edifice, than even the larger materials:*

οὕτε γὰρ ἀνὴ τῶν μικρῶν τοὺς μεγάλους φασιν οἱ λιθολογοὶ λιθὸν ἐν κεῖσθαι.

To produce a few illustrations out of many; how often is it the case that the Greek pronouns remain sources of perplexity to the student during his whole course, causing him frequently to leave sentences imperfectly understood, even when all the words have been carefully examined with

* "As architects affirm, that great stones cannot well be placed together in a building without little ones." *Plato de legibus, X.* This remark of the divine philosopher may be well accommodated to the matter of which we are treating, although it is applied by him to the far higher subject of the dependence of a general upon a special providence.

the lexicon, for the want of the ready knowledge and prompt application of some rule which would at once have prevented all difficulty. In such cases either impatience or indolence tempts him to pass it over, or the same reference must be made hundreds of times to the grammar, because he has no precise formula treasured up in his memory as a guide to his researches. It is not too much to say, that a few days' patient exercise of the memory, at the proper time, might have prevented months from being afterwards ineffectually wasted. The same remark may be made in reference to some neglected rule of syntax. It is plausibly said, that these may be better learned and treasured up by observation. Did not experience contradict the assertion, it must be false from the very nature of things. In the one case the student, like the ready architect, has his rule constantly in his possession, to be at once applied to the measurement of every difficulty that arises. In the other the rule itself becomes the object of search. When it has at length been found and applied to the removal of present impediments, it is then laid aside, and in consequence of its being connected with no remembered form of words, the same wearisome and unsatisfactory process is constantly to be repeated.

Difficulties suffered in this way to accumulate, present a more appalling and discouraging prospect to the apparently advanced student than to the tyro to whom all is new. Surveyed in the mass and from the ground of a superficial progress, they appear magnified beyond their real extent. They seem to beset his path both before and behind. The ground over which he has passed appears as much, if not more encumbered than that on which he is yet to enter. Onward he often feels he cannot go, and backward he dare not look, in consequence of the great amount of work he has left undone. Hurried in this manner through his grammar, and carried still more rapidly through the careless reading of a number of Latin authors; wearied with the dull monotony of daily turning over the leaves of his lexicon, and finding that the only progress he is in reality making is only a discovery of increasing perplexities, why is it a matter of wonder that the strongest repugnance is often manifested to the exercises in which he is compelled to be engaged? With every new author he finds only a repetition of the same unsatisfactory toil. No facilities in reading have been

acquired. Virgil is as difficult as Cæsar; Cicero is still more difficult than Virgil; Horace is a senseless maze; Livy a wilderness of intricate and inexplicable constructions; and in the last book that he is required to read in his collegiate course, he finds that he has but little if any more command of the language than when he first set out. He has acquired but the mere scanty recollections of disconnected words, whose poor remains have barely lodged in the surface of the memory, forming no part of the furniture of the mind, and never entering into the habitual channels of thought. The language has never been made his own. He has never learned, in any degree to think in it. He has never had its grammatical forms and syntactical idioms associated with the words to which they alone can impart life and meaning. He has never been exercised by constant writing, to a necessary study of those peculiarities which escape the attention in mere reading, and without which, even under the most favorable circumstances, he cannot be said to have acquired more than half the language. We have heard students feelingly complain of their grievous disappointment, when having expected by the time they had finished their collegiate course, to read almost any Greek or Latin author with some degree of facility, they have found themselves no nearer their object than they had been years before, and the last author presenting almost the same difficulties as the first.

Under such a course of instruction as we have been attempting to describe, the student's progress at first often seems most rapid; but the deluded victim soon arrives at a stopping point, beyond which his own and all the exertions of his teachers fail to carry him. Here he remains stationary for years, or else abandons the study in disgust. In this situation, the best service that could be rendered would be, if possible, to divest his mind of all he had thus loosely acquired, and kindly restore him to his former state of blank ignorance. Some have the moral courage to retrace their steps and begin anew; but most, amid intricacies and perplexities still more and more increasing, press on their dark and joyless way, and at the end of their course, add to the swelling crowd who are continually increasing the force of the standing objection to the study of classical literature.

The plan proposed in this article, as we said before, presents no claim to the merit of originality. It is the same old method that was formerly practised in the Eton and

Westminster schools, and the English universities, embracing many other things which our hasty and concise sketch did not allow us to mention. It is the same method which produced those thorough classical scholars whose attainments we now regard with astonishment; among whom were not only those distinguished theologians who have been the ornament and defence of Christianity, but also (what with us would be a still greater subject of wonder) many who ranked high in the lists of politicians and statesmen. Why may not the same results be produced in our day and in our own land? Even should it require the same, or even a longer time than that which is ordinarily occupied, it cannot be devoted to a more worthy object or a more useful branch of education. But if it can be shown that on the plan proposed there will be an actual saving of time, there should be no hesitation in at once adopting it, and utterly discarding all those pretended labor-saving methods which have been tried by dear-bought experience and found wanting. That this will be the case, has, we think, been shown from considerations before mentioned. We do not, however, by any means intend to assert, that the loose method of which we have so freely spoken, and which we have contrasted with the one recommended, has a universal prevalence throughout our country. There are unquestionably honorable exceptions both in our academies and higher institutions. That we have a right to speak of it as being, with some modifications, the one most generally adopted, is shown by the fact, which cannot be denied, that so little fruit is produced by the study of the classics throughout our country. To talk of any saving of time in comparison with such a system is absurd. The whole time may be said to be lost. The few who in this mode of instruction become good classical scholars are exceptions to the general results. An early relish for the literature of antiquity, the result of circumstances or accidental causes, or indefatigable application which no mode of instruction, however vicious, can ever wholly disappoint, may sometimes produce results of a different kind. But these cases are comparatively rare. We cannot therefore lose any thing by adopting a different method; a method which was unquestionably practised during the best periods of English literature; which has been tried in some of our own schools with the most encouraging success, and which needs only to become general throughout our land, to wipe out

wholly the reproach which, in this respect, has been cast upon our seminaries of learning.

It may be well, however, to enter into a more minute estimate of the manner in which we conceive this is to be effected. Let us suppose the time allotted to preparation for the lowest classes in college to be four years; during which period the languages are studied in connection with the mathematics, as the two main branches; an equal portion of time being allotted to each. It is taken for granted, that the student has previously gone through what are styled the ordinary branches of English education, and that he has been well exercised in English grammar. We have supposed the half of each day for one year to be occupied with the Latin grammar, as the principal study; including however the other exercises above mentioned, as subordinate auxiliaries. This has been allotted as the farthest possible extension of time necessary. Six months, in ordinary cases, would be amply sufficient to render a boy master of his grammar, and enable him to treasure the whole of it correctly in his memory. Six months more might be spent in what may be called the application of the grammar, or the slow and sure reading of some Latin author, in the manner which we have previously pointed out; the amount read being regarded as a matter of minor importance, and the main object being to stereotype in the mind the grammatical structure, and render, as familiar as possible, all its forms, rules and inflections. During this exercise he will also have acquired a large stock of words derived from the grammatical forms and examples, and also from the author whom he has been thus carefully reading. This stock of words will be of the highest possible value, in consequence of being associated with grammatical principles, and calculated to suggest them to the thoughts in all subsequent reading. We will suppose the portion read during this period to be the first book of the *Æneid*, although perhaps this is not the best selection which might be made. It is not too much to say, that in these eight hundred lines is contained the substantial part of the Latin language, both in respect to words and syntax. Suppose this to have been committed to memory, and rendered, by double translations, from Latin to English, and from English to Latin, the primary and metaphorical sense of every word carefully explained, and the whole so thoroughly studied, that every word has been minutely

examined in all its syntactical relations, and carefully inflected through all its forms, with every grammatical rule and observation accurately repeated, on the occurrence of every peculiarity with which it is connected; can it be doubted that a year, thus faithfully and patiently devoted to these exercises, will leave the student very far in advance of those who have been hurried, by other methods, over apparently a much greater extent of ground? May we not go still farther, and say, that one thus instructed, and with such habits of accurate study, will be in advance, in respect to actual and substantial knowledge of the language, of many who have enjoyed the advantages of a collegiate course?

At the end of one year, or, at the farthest, of two, we suppose him to commence a course of reading, in which he may be pushed forward at his fullest speed. Habits of the most perfect accuracy (almost the whole of education) have been acquired. A most minute acquaintance with the grammatical structure has been secured. A large stock of words has been already laid up, and these words are not merely disconnected substitutes for English terms, but associated, each as the representative of some grammatical peculiarity of inflection or syntax, and calculated, whenever they occur in subsequent reading, to recall to mind his previous acquisitions. In addition to completing his stock of words, (which, after this previous preparation, we have every reason to believe will be most rapidly accomplished,) he has one thing yet to acquire. We mean by this, what may be called tact in reading; a readiness in seizing the meaning of a sentence at a glance; in having the thought arise to the mind directly from the Latin, in the Latin order, and without the intervention of any English words, in the way of either verbal or mental construing. This can only be acquired by practice, or by continual and extensive reading; and that he may be now enabled to pursue this as his principal object, unembarrassed by other difficulties, is the great reason for his former slow and cautious progress. The new words which he now meets with will be comparatively few; the new grammatical constructions still more rare. These being daily noted in a memorandum book, and the memory refreshed by a frequent recurrence to it, their number will be every day constantly diminishing, till he will soon find that he can read whole pages in any common author without resort to grammar or lexicon. It is not an extravagant estimate to suppose, that

having commenced this period with reading three or four pages of an author per day, he may, before the end of the year, read from twenty to twenty-five ; and thus, reckoning a daily average of fifteen pages during the year, he may be safely supposed to have read during that time between four and five thousand pages ; or a larger quantity than the whole amount of all the scattered fragments to which, in the ordinary method, his attention is directed from the commencement of his study to the end of his collegiate course. During the third year he may be permitted to commence the Greek. It needs no proof, that after the faculties of memory, attention and investigation have been thus exercised in the Latin, a far less time will be required in this department ; and that at the end of the fourth year he may be supposed to have made in it a similar degree of progress. Experience has shown that after a certain stage of advancement, the study of the two languages together instead of impeding, actually accelerates the progress in each ; and this will be the more especially the case, if the student is required to use Greek and Latin lexicons, and Greek authors with Latin notes. During the fourth year, however, the daily time allotted to the languages may be supposed to be principally devoted to the Greek, with a diminished reading of the Latin. At the end of the fourth year of his academical course, and at the age of sixteen or seventeen years, our tyro may be regarded as prepared for college. Classes thus prepared will furnish the professor with his proper subjects, and will allow him to discharge those appropriate duties to which we have before adverted. Instead of recitations there may be substituted, especially in the higher classes, lectures on any Greek or Latin author that may be selected. Such lectures, instead of a long time devoted to previous preparation on the part of the student, would require nothing more than the taking of notes, and a brief examination each day of what had been acquired by the exercises of the preceding. Classes will be able, or should be able, to follow and understand their instructor in critical or philosophical dissertations on any author that he might select ; and in these selections he might take a range which, before the end of their collegiate course, would render them familiar with the general mass of classical history, poetry and philosophy. Another advantage in this would consist in its allowing them more time for those indispensa-

ble branches of natural science which now necessarily form so large a department in every course of education.

To the results which we have given in this hurried sketch we are well aware that many exceptions might be stated. There might be frequent failures in realizing all the benefits which have been imagined ; but we do firmly believe, that on a fair trial these consequences would generally follow. Every thing would depend on the plan of the first year, or the first two years being patiently and rigidly adhered to. It is in this part of the course that temptations would most powerfully beset the teacher to depart from the line marked out ; but if these temptations are perseveringly resisted, and the student, however reluctant, is given to understand that the whole grammar, and nothing less than the whole grammar, is expected to be thoroughly mastered, it does seem to us that, with ordinary minds, the results must be such as have been described, and that with extraordinary minds, they may be such as to exceed our most sanguine anticipation.

The most formidable objection seems to lie against this method of studying the grammar. Memoriter instruction has been so long neglected, and more easy methods so much resorted to, that the faculty of memory seems every where weakened and incapable of those efforts which in former times, and under more rigid discipline, it has been known to put forth. In consequence of this the idea of committing to memory whole grammars, including exceptions, observations, irregular forms and lists of irregular verbs, appears frightful both to the scholar and the teacher. A greater difficulty still seems connected with the thought of retaining such a mass in the memory, after its various parts have been once committed. It may be admitted, that if the scholar can acquire two pages one day he may do the same the next, and so on as long as the exercise is continued ; but how shall all this be retained ? is the great question. The answer brings us to another very simple process in the art of teaching, which solves the difficulty at once. It is the process of constant daily repetition, or of repeating every day from the beginning of the book until the space passed over renders it too long for one recitation, and then beginning back and going over the same process, until in each review the class is brought up to the point of present advancement. Nor will this require the time at recitation which would at first seem necessary.

Great patience and perseverance might be demanded for a few first lessons, but after this each repetition will produce such a familiarity with the language, and such a readiness and rapidity of utterance, that a great amount of space may be passed over in a very short time; and this readiness would be increased at every similar trial. With a class well exercised in this manner from the beginning, the whole Greek verb might be distinctly pronounced in less than ten minutes, and the half, if not the whole of one of our larger grammars might be repeated in one Saturday forenoon, or some other time specially devoted to the object. By this means the grammar is learned in that manner which some affect so much to condemn, viz. *by rote*. It becomes (if we may repeat an expression which we have several times used) stereotyped in the memory; or rather it passes beyond the domain of memory, and enters into the habitual associations of thought. It is by this severe exercise of the memory at first, that it is afterwards actually relieved from that heavy burthen which other modes of instruction throw upon it. The forms and rules no longer require the painful effort of recollection, or the still more toilsome process of constant recurrence to the book. They are no longer remembered, but like the, forms and peculiarities of our own language, become a part of the inner property of the mind. A wrong inflection or construction is no longer simply *remembered* but is *felt*, to be wrong. Bad grammar in Greek or Latin (if we may use a common expression) *sounds bad* as well as in English. It is thus we claim by this process, however paradoxical it may appear, actually to relieve the memory in all the subsequent part of the student's course.

It may also be objected, that many parts of the grammar must remain unintelligible until after a considerable progress in reading. This difficulty has been greatly overrated, and it may be wholly obviated by the continual parsing of appropriate examples under every rule. This, although involving to a certain degree the knowledge of words, may be legitimately included in the study of the grammar. Admitting, however, that after all some parts may not be fully understood, there is a great advantage in having them stored in the memory. When the time comes for their more perfect application, such parts will be much more likely to be intelligible, than though this process had been neglected; and perhaps a great cause of the confusion and perplexity of

those who have taken an opposite course, arises from the mind not having been familiarized, by constant verbal repetition, to the *logical language* of grammar. There is a spirit in *words*, however much their value may be underrated in this age of *things*. There is a power in well arranged and logical formulas of expression, tending to produce thought, and at the first impulse from the presentation of the subject to which they are applicable, to manifest their own fitness and render themselves intelligible. Perhaps there is no greater fallacy, in some of our present modes of education, than that practice which directs youth to reject the use of well made formulas as slavish and parrot-like, and makes it a merit that they should express their ideas in their own language. *Their ideas!* What ideas will they have if this mode of instruction is followed out in all its consequences? And what will *their own language* be but unmeaning jargon, producing, as a necessary consequence, utter confusion of thought, and imbecility of mind, if they are taught to reject those forms of sound words, which have cost the labor and study of more experienced intellects? Authority is the first lesson, as well for the intellectual as the moral nature of man, and previous submission to it is the surest guaranty of subsequent mental independence. We have already made this present article longer than was at first intended. We would therefore close abruptly by the expression of the conviction, that although some of our expectations may be unfounded, and some of our calculations may appear extravagant, there are at all events a few thoughts which are worthy the attentive consideration of teachers and taught. We may appear to have indulged in unnecessary repetitions, but if so, it has arisen from a strong desire to impress upon the mind, by every means in our power, the importance of a simple, yet exceedingly valuable principle of common sense, which is too much overlooked in most of our modern modes of instruction.

ART. IX.—REVIEW OF DR. OWEN ON THE CHURCH.

By REV. LYMAN H. ATWATER, Fairfield, Conn.

The works of John Owen, D. D., Edited by Thomas Russel, A. M. with Memoirs of his Life and Writings, by William Owen. Vol. xx. Containing an Inquiry into the Original Nature, Institution, Power, and Communion of Evangelical Churches: an answer to Dr. Stillingfleet's book on the Unreasonableness of Separation; and the True Nature of a Gospel Church and its Government. London, 1826.

OUR conversation and reading, for some time past, have led us to the conviction, that multitudes are in a state of mind in regard to Church government, which differs little from unbelief or skepticism. By this we mean that they are either undecided, whether the great Head of the Church has appointed any definite Church state, or mode of mutual association and rule for his people; or that, if such as are satisfied that there is a divinely appointed Church constitution, many are avowedly doubtful or ignorant what it is; and others do not believe it to be of binding and immutable authority, but rather as designed by its Author to be varied and accommodated to our present views of convenience and expediency. We are far from saying this in a spirit of severity; for we confess that we have sinned ignorantly and in unbelief; and it becomes him that is guiltless to cast the first stone. Nor was it till after repeated attempts to learn from others of riper knowledge and experience, the right way of the Lord, and thus obtain a sure foot-hold of rest to the soul, that we became aware of the fact we have declared. But of its truth, we think there can be no dispute.

As the inevitable consequence, we see the most discordant and heterogeneous views of Church polity every where advanced. As it ever falls out in things pertaining to the worship of God, when men cast off his wisdom to lean to their own understanding, their own projects for erecting the most stupendous frame-work on which they may ascend to heaven, are baffled as soon as undertaken, by a Babel confusion of tongues. In the order and constitution of the visible Church, we meet with every diversity of opinion among respectable men. From that deluded bigotry which conceives an outward participation of the ordinances from the ministers of a particular communion,

to be the way and the only way to heaven; that a Church, no matter how far it is from conformity to the platform laid down by the apostles, becomes the only apostolic Church, by the supposed derivation of the ordination of its ministers in an unbroken succession from the apostles; that the sacraments administered by a ministry thus derived, whatever be their character, of themselves confer saving grace irrespective of the state of the recipient; that all ordinances dispensed by any other ministry, no matter how *truly* apostolic its character, are irregular and invalid; and that the receivers of them, however manifest their holiness of life, are consigned to the uncovenanted mercies of God: from this pinnacle of arrogant pretensions we have every grade in the scale of descent, till we find the opposite extreme in the lowest pitch of laxness; and it is more than intimated, on the gravest authority, that the existing ecclesiastical associations of the different denominations of Christians are so many voluntary societies, of human origin and institution.

A natural attendant of this chaos of opinions, both as cause and effect, is the habit of speaking and acting in regard to different forms of faith and worship, rather as matters of taste, in which every one may guide his choice by his own fancy, feelings, convenience and ease, than as things appointed of God, in which we are bound to learn and obey his will. It is not uncommon to hear persons say, that they choose to be Episcopalians because they discern a beauty in the liturgy and forms of worship, and an efficiency in the government to repress disorder, fanaticism and contention; and others again, that they will be Congregationalists because they love simplicity and freedom from the constraints of forms and prelatical rule. Ministers often speak of different forms of Church government, as best suited to the temper and habits of the people who adopt them, and assign this as a sufficient warrant for their adoption, without proceeding to inquire whether any of them are according to the New Testament pattern. We think that we offend not against charity in saying, that even ministers have gone from one denomination to another not in communion with that to which they belonged, impelled not so much by their convictions of the conformity of their newly adopted church to the commands of God, as by the prospect of a more easy, flattering or congenial situation, or of shunning troubles for which they have an especial disrelish, albeit, as it usually

turns out in such cases, they speedily become the stoutest champions of the *Divino jure* claims of the *one, only, apostolic Church*, without which full salvation is at best precarious. What else ought we to expect? In things having no higher warrant than human wisdom and authority, men surely will follow their own judgment and pleasure, and in so far as members of the different denominations proceed upon the supposition, that there is no divinely instituted model of Church government to which they are bound in conscience to endeavor to conform, they will shift their position to suit their pleasure and conveniences. They will originate new usages and principles to meet new emergencies, till the spiritual order, rule and service, which have been ordained by the great High Priest over the house of God, are overrun and trampled down by the vast progeny of alien intruders, of which man's wit and will are so prolific.

This state of things supposes that there is, to an extent alike culpable and dangerous, a lethargic indifference to the whole subject. When ecclesiastical attachments are based rather on habit, taste, convenience, and expediency, than on rational conviction, resulting from careful inquiry concerning the mind and will of God, there must be an appalling lack of interest and diligence to investigate the teachings of his word. Ignorance, doubt, indifference, or a torpid sense of our obligation to render scrupulous conformity to the divine precepts, open the sluice-gates, and remove all obstacles to an inundation of corruptions and disorders. And this is not the worst evil. It is accompanied with a horrible decay of conscientiousness. An indolent indifference to the truth of God, is but another name for a careless unconcern about obeying his will; and an elastic pliancy to all sorts of ways, in things of divine institution, implies an elasticity of conscience which needs tracing somewhat by the precept, *Prove all things. Hold fast that which is good. Abstain from all appearance of evil.* For ourselves, we hesitate not to say, we shall deem it an auspicious omen for the cause of pure religion and morals, when the members of every church join it because they believe its faith and order more according to the Bible than those of any other communion whatever, and that on that account they are solemnly bound to join it. In such an event, we should not be concerned for our own sentiments, neither would any conscientious man fear for the success of his own principles.

Whoever is at all familiar with the tone of thinking on this subject, which has of late been developed, must see that these observations bear with especial force upon some notions of Congregationalism, which are widely entertained, and indeed, by many are taken for granted. So far as we can discover, very many regard it as a contrivance to get rid of all Church authority and rule whatsoever. This conception of it seems to prevail more or less among persons of all sects and parties out of our communion. The very word Congregational seems to be associated in their minds with laxness, freedom from restraint, impotence to purge out heresy or scandals, a license to teach and do as we please, inadequacy either to preserve or propagate the Gospel, and in short, a kind of spiritual Jacobinism. They seem to consider the avowed principle on which it is based by its adherents to be, that there is no particular Church state or mode of ecclesiastical union, power and authority, appointed in the Bible, but that men are left to their own election as to the kind of Church government they will have, and that Congregationalism is chosen as being most free, liberal, and agreeable to our republican institutions. And we are sorry to see indications that some of these ideas receive too much countenance from some respectable Congregationalists, and that very many in New-England conceive that something of this kind constitutes the peculiar excellence, the crowning glory of their ecclesiastical polity. As a necessary consequence, the orthodox part of the Presbyterian Church view Congregationalism with a jealous eye, as a mother of all their disorders and heresies. The other party appear to regard it as a friend and ally, a platform peculiarly congenial to latitudinarianism in doctrine and order. While some, as we are informed, too loose and radical, too fervent in their zeal and expansive in their schemes of reform, to be confined within the metes and bounds of Church order, in connection with either of the preceding bodies, have receded and adopted the Congregational system, under the notion that they will be no longer fettered in doing what they please. In such a state of things, when modes of procedure in regard to ecclesiastical works, confessedly on other grounds most questionable, as a last resort flee to Congregationalism for refuge, pleading that they are in accordance with its spirit, or that it furnishes their occasion, necessity, and justification, we have found it necessary to review

our opinions upon Church government *ab origine* re-examine the foundation on which they rest, and, in particular, to inquire into the proper nature and grounds of Congregationalism as understood by those defenders of it who are of most acknowledged weight and authority, and whom God raised up to be the signal instruments of reviving and promoting it since the reformation.

Among them, Dr. John Owen stands pre-eminent. More thorough, elaborate and masterly treatises than his, in vindication of the faith, order and practice of the reformed churches, against the corruptions and usurpations of Papal antichrist, can scarcely be found in the whole range of Protestant literature. While he thus fought manfully in defence of the common cause, he was not less vigilant and industrious in rescuing Protestantism from the numerous perversions and corruptions with which it was infested. Socinians, Arminians, Pelagians, Enthusiasts, Fanatics, Mystics, Formalists, Brownists, Prelatists, found in him an invincible antagonist, who, with all gospel meekness and love, was valiant for the truth, thoroughly furnished from the Scriptures with spiritual weapons for his high warfare, and mighty, through God, to the pulling down of their strong holds. He was particularly intent upon reducing the polity of the Church to the simplicity and purity of the apostolic standard, convinced that the interests of pure and undefiled religion were greatly concerned therein. He observed that the first reformers were principally absorbed in purging out the leaven of corrupt doctrines, which vitiated and destroyed the very essence of religion; and that, while they cast off the Papal yoke, they very properly omitted giving any special and profound attention to the precise mode of government for the Church delineated in the Scriptures, justly deeming it a matter secondary and subsequent to the main work in which they had embarked. He was foremost in defending the non-conformists against the arrogant pretensions and lordly denunciations of the prelacy. He vindicated their faith, worship, polity, separation and non-conformity. He labored to prove their doctrine, worship and organization, according to the command of Christ, and that they dissented from the church of England only so far as that church dissented from the institutions of Christ. But his labors were not merely or chiefly polemic and defensive. While he warded off the unfair attacks of adversaries, he wrote on this as on other subjects,

independent, didactic treatises, in which he handled the various points relating to the Church state in all their aspects. In the first and last of the treatises in the book whose title heads this article, the great principles of Church government are discussed in that profound and lucid manner which characterizes all the works of John Owen. He exhausts the subject. He bases all his sentiments on Scriptural testimonies, copiously adduced, leaves no material objection unnoticed, and omits the consideration of no important branch of the subject. He is an ardent Congregationalist, and discovers to us the foundation on which it rests, if it can be found at all. Here, if any where, we can learn the nature and principles of primitive Congregationalism, according to its most celebrated advocates. These treatises contain many valuable principles, most clearly developed and ably defended; principles which have been overlooked or openly disregarded, by too many in the Congregationalist church. We have therefore concluded to give an abstract of his views on some material points, hoping that it may at least have the effect to induce some to peruse the treatise itself. Complaint has often been made of Owen's style as being tedious, prolix, involved and encumbered with much superfluous matter. We know that there is an infelicity in the construction of his sentences. His language is often heavy and unwieldy. But nevertheless it is precise, and we think that a repeated perusal of his writings will acquit him of the charge of superfluity. It will be difficult to shave off any thing, without weakening the compactness and strength of the argument. We know that much may be removed without destroying the thought, but little without enfeebling it. His arguments are like a massive fortress, which every additional layer renders stronger and more impregnable, although, if made on a much smaller scale it would endure ordinary assaults. On a careful reading it will appear that the most involved sentences contain no clause, or even word, that does not suggest some important idea or shade of meaning, or parry off some apprehended objection. But to the book itself.

A cardinal question in the handling of this subject, is whether the Church is a divine institution, or a voluntary establishment of men; whether its origin, constitution, forms, privileges, functions, duties, be appointed of God in his word, or are self-created, humanly invented, and are left to the disposal of men. Self-evident as the answer to this question

may seem, on its first proposal, yet we are satisfied that it is in fact, if not in form, the fundamental question at issue in some important controversies of the present day. So really is this the case, that we are persuaded that a fair decision of it, consistently followed out, will settle some of the most important disputes now agitated in regard to the proper functions of the Church; and however some may be startled at the supposed necessity of discussing this point, in the present state of the public mind, little progress can be made in deciding important questions respecting Congregationalism, till this principal one is determined. And whoever labors to that end, without this preliminary step, spends his strength for naught, in a mere shadow-fight, in which he must run as uncertainly, and fight as one that beateth the air. Our author therefore begins his inquiry into the original nature, institution, power, order, and communion of evangelical churches as follows:

“When any thing which is pleaded to belong unto religion or the worship of God is proposed unto us, our first consideration of it ought to be in that inquiry which our Lord Jesus Christ made of the Pharisees concerning the baptism of John. ‘Whence is it? from heaven or of men?’ He distributes all things which come under that plea or pretence into two heads, as unto their original and efficient cause, namely, heaven and men. And these are not only different and distinct, but so contradictory one unto another, that they cannot concur as partial causes of the same effect. What is of men is not from heaven, and what is from heaven is not of men. And hence is his determination concerning both sorts of these things: ‘Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up.’ Matt. xv. 13.

“Designing, therefore, to treat of churches, their original nature, use and end, my first inquiry must be, whether they are from heaven or of men; that is, whether they are of a divine original, having a divine institution, or whether they are an ordinance or creation of men; for their pedigree must be derived from one of these singly; they never concurred in the constitution of any part of divine worship, or any thing that belongs thereunto.

“This would seem a case and inquiry of an exceeding easy determination; for the Scripture every where makes mention of the Church or Churches, as the ordinances and institutions of God.” pp. 65, 66.

All this appears indisputable. We see not how any who believe in divine revelation can take exception to it. Our author shows his practised skill as a disputant, and his profound insight into the nature of the subject, in grappling this point at the threshold. He measured well his ground, and knew that every inch which he did not fortify would be seized by his adversaries. And he had found out by experience, that his most cogent and conclusive reasonings out of the Scriptures concerning the doctrine and government of the Church would be evaded by them on the pretext that the Scripture is not the sole guide in these things. Of what avail therefore was it to construct an adamant chain of proof and argument, unless he could find a firm support to sustain it? Supererogatory as the work may seem, of proving that the Church and all that properly belongs to it is of divine appointment, the simple fact is, that when favorite institutions and ways of proceeding for accomplishing the great ends of the Church of Christ, are shown to be without Scriptural warrant, their advocates will at once betake themselves to the only remaining shelter, namely, that the structure, composition, polity and arrangements of the Church are left to the wisdom and will of man. This is their plea in substance if not in set form. And this was the great subterfuge of the Papists and Prelatists from the overwhelming testimonies of the Bible arrayed against them by Owen, the non-conformists and our puritan fathers, who planted the Congregational churches of this country. Indeed on this point lay the whole stress of the conflict, for upon it the other controversies chiefly hinged. Nay, the distinctive motto of the puritans was, that nothing is to be admitted in religion, "which is not either expressly contained in the Bible or clearly deducible therefrom." This was their impregnable shield and two-edged sword.

Strict adherence to it led them to all those peculiarities of doctrine and order, in which they differed, and on account of which they separated from the established church. Some following this principle, thought Presbyterianism, others Congregationalism, to be according to the Scriptures, with scarcely any difference, however, as to doctrines, practice and worship, and so little as to the matter, form, ends, and duties of the Church, that they are viewed generally as essentially one denomination, and as such have steadily maintained mutual communion. So wide of the truth is the prevalent impression,

that it is the original nature and genius of Congregationalism to be loose, to confer an immunity from Scriptural restraints, and afford a theatre for whatever expedients and inventions men may see fit to devise and set on foot. It had its origin and being in the unconquerable determination to exclude every thing from the precincts of the Church, which was not placed there by its great Head. And we will add, that so far as it has deviated from this principle, it has lost its primitive soundness, beauty and splendor. These assertions we will substantiate by some further quotations from our author.

In the absence of divine revelation, the light of nature teaches something concerning God and his worship, enough at least to convince men of guilt, Rom. i. 19, 20. And in the supernatural revelations and institutions of the Bible, some things are presupposed as the preliminary ground and occasion of them : e. g. that there is a God ; that the persons whom it addresses are human beings bound to worship him ; that they are social beings and bound to worship him, not only in their individual but also in their social capacity ; and that they have too far degenerated from their original integrity, and are too much darkened in their understandings by the fall, to institute and offer acceptable worship, without special supernatural revelations and assistances. Aside from the light of divine revelation, therefore, our author says, " These things are evident in themselves : 1. That God created our nature, or made man for his own worship and service, and fitted the powers and faculties of his soul thereunto. 2. That this nature is so fitted for society, so framed for it as to its next end, that without it, it cannot act itself, according unto what it is empowered unto. And this is the foundation of all order and government in the world among mankind. 3. That, by the light of nature, this acting in society is principally designed unto the worship of God. The power, I say, and necessity of acting in society, is given unto our nature for this end principally, that we may thus glorify God in and by the worship which he requires of us. 4. That without the worship of God in societies, there would be an absolute failure of one principal end in the creation of man ; nor would any glory arise unto God from the constitution of his nature so fitted for society, as that it cannot act its own powers without it. 5. All societies are to be regulated in the light of nature by such circumstances, as whereby they are suited unto their end ; for

which they may be either too large or too much restrained." pp. 71, 72.

The sum of this is, that the Church state is appointed for those who are constituted with faculties meet for it, not for solitary and isolated beings; just as we are constituted rational and accountable beings, who are therefore bound to serve and glorify God. The religion of the Bible is not appointed for stocks or brutes, but for human beings, who are suited to the service of God, and are bound by the dictates of natural conscience to discharge it, and as they are social beings, to do it in the way of united worship. But this fact does not authorize men to organize a Church state after the pattern of their own wisdom, when there is one appointed by special revelation, any more than to institute and promulgate a system of doctrine of their own devising, either to improve or supplant the Scriptural system; because without divine revelation, the light of nature gives some faint glimmerings of truth and duty, which yet are so overshadowed by our corruption, that they are insufficient guides to acceptable worship, and leave us totally dependent on the Bible for all adequate knowledge in things pertaining to God. Hence our author declares our element of fitness is to adopt this Church state, taught by the light of nature, to be:—

"That they be ready to receive all divine revelations with faith and obedience, which shall either appoint the ways of God's worship, and prescribe the duties of it, or guide and direct them in its performance, and to regulate their obedience therein. This also is a clear unquestionable dictate of the law of nature, nor can it be denied but on principles of downright atheism." p. 72. Again:

"1. Whereas, the directions given by the light of nature in and unto things concerning the outward worship of God, are general only, so that, by them alone, it would be very difficult to erect a Church state in good and holy order; God did always from the beginning, by especial revelations and institution, ordain such things as might perfect the conduct of that light unto such a complete order, as was accepted with himself." * * * 2. "That before the coming of Christ, who was to perfect and complete all divine revelations, and state all things belonging to the house and worship of God, so as never to admit of the least change or alteration; this Church state, as unto outward order, rites

of worship, ways and manner of the administration of things sacred, with its bounds and limits, was changeable, and variously changed. * * * 3. That it was God himself who made all these changes; nor would he, nor did he ever allow, that the wills, wisdom, or authority of men, should prescribe rules or measures unto his worship in any thing. Heb. iii. 1—6.

"4. That the foundation of every Church state that is accepted with God is an express covenant with him that they receive and enter into, who are to be admitted into that state. A Church not founded in covenant with God, is not from heaven but of men." * * * 5. "There is no good in, there is no benefit to be obtained by any Church state whatsoever, unless we enter into it, and observe it by an act of obedience, with immediate respect unto the authority of Christ by whom it is appointed, and the observation of it prescribed unto us. Matt. xxviii. 18—20. Hence,

"6. Unless men, by their voluntary choice and consent, out of a sense of their duty unto the authority of Christ in his institutions, do enter into a Church state, they cannot by any other ways or means be so framed into it, as to find acceptance with God therein. 2 Cor. viii. 5. And the interpositions that are made by custom, tradition, the institutions and ordinances of men, between the consciences of them who belong or would belong unto such a state, and the immediate authority of God, is highly obstructive of this divine order and all the benefits of it." pp. 73, 74.

In this first chapter, Owen treats of the teachings of the light of nature upon this subject; and lest the import of any isolated paragraph should be interpreted contrary to the tenor of his general principles, we have been thus full in our quotations to show what he did in fact maintain. The title of his next chapter is, "The especial original of the evangelical Church state." And he observes:

"I. The Church state of the New Testament doth not less relate unto, and receive force from the light or law of nature, than any other state of the Church whatsoever." p. 75. Or as is elsewhere observed, Christianity supposes men to have understanding, reason, conscience. While it reveals the great truth of redemption by Christ, and commands it to be preached with especial pre-eminence, it does not specify the precise times when, the arguments, appeals and length of discourse, with which it shall be set forth. This

is left to that natural discretion and spiritual wisdom about times, seasons, and proprieties, which is bestowed on all the good stewards of the mystery of God. But who would argue from this, that the liberty is given them of 'teaching for doctrines the commandments of men?' So our author observes in respect to the order of the Church:

"And it is merely from a spirit of contention, that some call on us or others, to produce express testimony or institution for every circumstance in the practice of religious duties in the Church; *and on a supposed failure herein, to conclude, that they have power themselves to institute and ordain such ceremonies as they think meet*, under a pretence of their being circumstances of worship; for as the directive light of nature is sufficient to guide us in these things, so the obligation of the Church unto it, makes all stated additions to be useless, as on other accounts they are noxious. Such things as these are the times and seasons of Church assemblies, the order and decency wherein all things are to be transacted in them, the bounding them as unto the number of their members, and places of habitation, so as to answer the ends of their institution, * * * and the like; *the things themselves being divinely instituted*, are capable of such general directions in and by the light of nature, as may, with ordinary Christian prudence, be on all occasions applied unto the use and practice of the Church." pp. 75, 76.

We cannot think any labor lost, which goes to define the true office and scope of human reason in regard to matters divinely revealed. It will do much to settle many controverted and agitating points, which never can otherwise be laid to rest. We think the foregoing views just and irrefragable. They must have the sanction and acquiescence of all who would not disavow their rational nature on the one hand, or usurp the divine prerogative of appointing the doctrines, institutions, and laws of the Church on the other. And we will add, that he takes the same ground on this subject, which has been taken by this journal, in its reasonings on the voluntary question. Having followed our author through the scaffolding, we are ready to proceed with him to the building of the temple. He says:

"But such is the especial nature and condition of the evangelical Church state; such the relation of it unto the person and mediation of Jesus Christ, with all things thereon depending; * * * that it must have a peculiar divine in-

stitution of its own, to evidence that it is from heaven and not from men. * * * For its truth a τελείωσι a perfect consummate state which the law could not bring it unto, though itself, its ordinances of worship, its rule and policy, were all of divine institution. And herein doth its excellency and preference above the legal Church state consist, as the apostle proves at large.* To suppose that this should be given unto it any other way but by divine authority in its institution, is to advance the wisdom and authority of men above those of God, and to render the gospel Church state a machine to be moved up and down at pleasure, to be new moulded or shaped according to occasions, or to be turned to any interest like the wings of a mill to the wind.

All the dignity, honor, and the perfection of the state of the Church under the Old Testament, depended solely hereon, that it was in the whole, and in all the particulars of it, of divine institution. Hence it was glorious, that is, very excellent, as the apostle declares, 2 Cor. iii. And if the Church state of the New Testament have not the same original, it must be esteemed to have a greater glory given unto it by the hand of men, than the other had as it was instituted by God himself: for a greater glory it hath as the apostle testifieth. Neither can any man, nor dareth any man alive, to give any instance in particular, *wherein there is the least defect, in the being, constitution, rule, and government of the gospel Church state, for want of divine institution; so as that it should be necessary to make a supply thereof by the wisdom and authority of men.*" pp. 76, 77.

This reasoning appears to us irrefragable. It needs no confirmation from us, and is what we have steadily maintained. But that there may be no mistake as to what the author means by Church, he tells us,

"The name of the Church, under the New Testament, is capable of a threefold application, or it is taken in a threefold notion: as (1.) For the catholic invisible Church, or society of elect believers in the whole world, really related by faith in him, unto the Lord Jesus Christ, as their mystical head. (2.) For the whole number of visible professors in the whole world, who by baptism and the outward profession of the gospel and obedience unto Christ, are distinguished from the rest of the world; and (3.) For such a

* In the omitted context the author quotes, Heb. vii. 11, 19, ix. 9, x. 1. in confirmation.

state as wherein the worship of God is to be celebrated in the way and manner by him appointed, and which is to be ruled by the power which he gives it, and according to the discipline which he hath ordained. * * * It is the Church in the latter sense alone, whose original we now inquire after: and I say,

4. That the original of this Church state is directly, immediately, and solely from Jesus Christ; he alone is the author, contriver, and institutor of it," pp. 77, 78.

He proceeds to explain, that he does not mean that Christ completed the Church state in his personal ministry upon earth, "exclusively of the ministry of others that he was pleased to make use of therein; but what was done by them he esteemed to be done all by himself," as what they ordained was immediately revealed to them from him." So he well says:

"They never did, neither jointly nor severally, once endeavor in their own wisdom, or by their own authority, to add or put into this Church state as of perpetual use, and belonging unto it as such, either less or more, any one thing greater or less whatsoever. It is true they gave their advice in sundry cases of present emergencies about Church affairs. * * * But to invent, contrive, institute, or appoint any thing in the Church and its state, which they had not by immediate revelation from Christ; they never attempted it, nor went about it. And unto this rule of proceeding, they were precisely obliged by the express words of their commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. This, I say, is so plainly included in the tenor of their commission, and so evident from all that is divinely recorded of their practice, that it will admit of no sober contradiction." pp. 78, 79.

And will any sober man contradict or gainsay it? If not, what becomes of the principle, that the non-prohibition of any institution, ordinance, or organization in the Church, is a sufficient warrant for its adoption, if it seem expedient? Owen, in the passages quoted, was striking the death blow at prelacy and papacy. And must the battle be fought over again? Or will it be contended, that it is competent for us to exercise a prerogative, which the apostles themselves dared not assume?

Our author proceeds to argue that "three things amongst others are eminently necessary to him who is to constitute this Church state, with all that belongs thereunto," and that the

"Scriptures eminently and expressly ascribe them all to Christ," and that they neither do nor can belong to any man, or set of men. The first is a sovereign right and title to the persons of men, which "Christ hath alone, and upon a treble account. (1.) Of donation from the Father. (2.) By virtue of purchase. (3.) Of conquest." The record is "authority which respects the rules, laws, orders and statutes to be made, prescribed and established."

"This authority is not only ascribed unto Jesus Christ in the Scripture, but it is enclosed unto him, so as that no other can have any interest in it. See Matt. xxviii. 18. Rev. iii. 7. Isa. ix. 6, 7. By virtue hereof, he is the only lawgiver of the Church; James iv. 12. Isa. xxxii. 22. There is indeed a derivation of power and authority from him unto others; but it extends no further, save only that they shall direct, teach, and command those whom he sends them unto, to do and observe what he hath commanded; Matt. xxviii. 20. 'He builds his own house,' and he is 'over his own house,' Heb. iii. 3—6. He both constitutes its state, and gives laws for its rule, p. 82. The third qualification, faithfulness, which is assigned unto the Lord Christ, Heb. iii. 3—5. To this is added the consideration of his wisdom, his love, his care for the good of his Church, which in him were ineffable and inimitable."

As to the question how far the particular form of the Church state is left to the option of men, our author says:

"And it is in vain pretended (as we shall see more afterward) that Christ indeed hath appointed this Church state in general; but that he hath appointed no particular form of churches, but left unto the discretion of men as they think meet." p. 81. He sums up the whole thus:

"Our principal assertion is, that Christ alone is the author, institutor, and appointer, in a way of authority and legislation, of the gospel Church state, its order, rule and worship, with all things perpetually belonging thereunto, or necessary to be observed therein. What is not so, is of men, and not from heaven. * * * If in any thing we do of this nature, we cannot answer the inquiry, which God directs in this case to be made, namely, why we do this or that thing. Exod. xii. 25, 27, with this, that it is because Christ hath required it of us, we do not acknowledge him the Lord over his own house, nor hear him as the Son. Nor is there any act of power to be put forth in the rule of the

Church, but in them by whom it is exerted it is an act of obedience to Christ, *or it is a mere usurpation.*" p. 91.

The assumption that things are wanting in the gospel Church for which men ought to provide, our author declares derogatory to the glory of Christ, especially as unto his faithfulness in and over the house of God, wherein he is compared unto and preferred above Moses. Heb. iii. 3, 6. "*But no instance can be given of any defect in his institutions that needs any supplement to be made by the best of men.*" p. 93. We are happy to know that if the principles we have advanced be protested against by any portion of the religious community, it will not be for want of responsible endorsers, whose capital consists in arguments that never have been and never can be refuted. As to the mode of ascertaining what is of divine appointment, our author says :

"It is the mind and will of Christ that immediately affects the consciences of believers unto obedience, by what way or means soever the knowledge of it be communicated unto them in Scripture, either by express words, or by just consequence from what is so expressed. Wherefore,

"The example and practice of the Apostles in the erection of churches, in the appointment of officers and rulers in them, in directions for their walking, order, administration of censures and all other holy things, are a sufficient indication of the mind and will of Christ about them. We do not say that in themselves they are institutions and appointments, but they infallibly declare what is so, or the mind of Christ concerning those things. Nor can this be questioned without a denial of their infallibility, faithfulness and divine authority." pp. 93, 94.

This, we suppose, will not be questioned. Having thus evinced the divine original of the Church, he proceeds in chap. iv., on "the especial nature of the gospel Church state," to develope its character. He thus defines it :

"The visible Church state which Christ hath instituted under the New Testament, consists in an especial society or congregation of professed believers, joined together according to his mind, with their officers, guides or rulers, whom he hath appointed, which do or may meet together, for the celebration of the ordinances of divine worship, the professing and authoritatively proposing the doctrine of the gospel, with the exercise of the discipline prescribed by himself unto their own mutual edification, with the glory of Christ,

in the *preservation and propagation of his kingdom in the world.*" p. 113.

That this is the gospel Church state, he goes on to prove, because, 1st. no other institution can answer the ends of the Church state. These are, 1. "The professed subjection of the souls and consciences of believers unto his (Christ's) authority in their observance of his commandments." 2d, "The joint celebration of all gospel ordinances and worship." 3d, "The exercise and preservation of the discipline appointed by Christ to be observed by his disciples." This consists (1.) in the preservation of the doctrine of the gospel in its purity, and obedience unto the commands of Christ in its integrity." (2.) "To preserve love entire among his disciples." (3.) "That it might be a due representation of his own love, care, tenderness, patience, meekness, in the acting of his authority in the Church." (4.) "To be an evidence and pledge of the future judgment." These ends, he argues, cannot be attained except on the supposition of their being fully intrusted to the care of particular societies of believers, and of their being, when joined together in the manner before described, complete churches. In answer to the allegation that they cannot attain these ends without the aid of some superior jurisdiction, to which their souls and consciences are subject, he says, among other things:

3 "Those particular congregations wherein these things are to be observed, are churches or they are not. If they are churches, they are of Christ's appointment, and we obtain what we aim at; nor is it in the power of any man to deprive them of any thing that belongs to them as such; if they are not, but inventions and appointments of their own, then what they say is this: that what is absolutely necessary unto the due observation of the worship of God, and all the ends of churches, being not appointed by Christ, is by them provided for, appointed, and ordained; which is to exalt themselves in wisdom and care above him, and to place themselves in a nearer relation to the Church than he." pp. 120, 121.

This describes to a nicety, the precise issue between those who advocate the principle that the church should superintend and execute its own work, and those who, on the ground of its insufficiency, insist on a transfer of some of its most important duties to the care and oversight of voluntary societies. And let it be remembered that Dr.

Owen penned it in vindication of Congregationalism, which is treated as being especially unfurnished for these high offices. If the inquiry is made whether he included in the ends of the Church state, the propagation of the gospel; we answer, (1.) That this is one of the most essential objects for which believers are associated together in this world, and that he most strenuously maintained that Congregationalism was best fitted to compass these ends. (2.) That it appears from the last clause of his definition of a visible Church already cited, which we have italicised. (3.) He expressly says in chap. VI., entitled, "Congregational churches alone suited to the ends of Christ in the institution of his Church."

"Another end of the institution of this state is that the Church might be the 'ground and pillar of truth.' 1 Tim. iii. 15; that is, that it might be the principal outward means to support, preserve, publish, declare *and propagate* the doctrine or truth of the gospel; especially that concerning the person and offices of Christ, which the apostle subjoins unto this assertion in the next words. That Church state which doth not answer these ends is not of divine institution. But this the ministry of these churches is eminently suited unto. There are three things required in this duty, or required unto this end, that the Church be the ground and pillar of the truth. (1.) That it preserve the truth in itself, and in the profession of all its members, against all seducers, false teachers and errors. * * * (2.) That each church take care that the same truth be preserved entire as unto the profession of it in all other churches. Their communion among themselves (whereof afterward) is built upon their common *ἰσχυρία* or profession of the same faith. * * * (3.) To propagate the gospel is required hereunto. pp. 167, 168, 170.

Our author pleads secondly that particular societies of believers associated together according to the terms of his definition of a church, are complete churches, from the uniform signification of the word church in the Scriptures. He argues that its original signification is an assembly or congregation, that may and does meet together. He argues that this is the fair exegesis of the word both in Hebrew and Greek, and that though "an assembly does not constitute a church, yet it is absolutely necessary to its constitution and exercise." He argues at great length from the first intimation of the Evangelical Church state in the New Testament, Matt. xviii. 17, 'If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to

the Church,' that a particular society of believers with its officers combined into a church state, must be meant. That it cannot mean, 'tell it to the Diocesan bishop, is evident.' That it does not mean 'tell it to the Church catholic,' is as plain, because this is impossible.

Having evinced the principal points which we designed to elucidate from the first of these treatises, respecting the divine original of the Church state, and its nature and genius, we now take leave of it to examine the second, which sets forth the "true nature of a gospel Church and government," with more particularity and minuteness. This treatise is distributed under the following heads. I. *The subject matter of the church.* II. *The formal cause of a particular church.* III. *Of the polity, rules or discipline of the church in general.* IV. *The officers of the church.* V. *The duty of pastors of the churches.* VI. *The office of teachers in the church.* VII. *Of the rule of the church, or of ruling elders.* VIII. *The nature of church polity or rule, with the duty of elders.* IX. *Of excommunication.* X. *Of the communion of churches.*

He begins thus :

"The church may be considered either as unto its essence, constitution and being, or as unto its power and order, when it is organized. As unto its essence and being, its constituent parts are its matter and form. These we must inquire into.

"By the matter of a church, we understand the persons whereof the church doth consist, with their qualifications; and by its form, the reason, cause and way of that kind of relation among them, which gives them the being of a church, and therewithal, an interest in all that belongs unto a church, either privilege or power as such." p. 353.

No question is more vital and fundamental than that handled in this chapter; viz. What personal qualifications give a right and title to membership in the visible Church? Upon the right answer to this, the right answer to various other questions considerably depends. It obviously depends on the character of the persons of which a Church is composed, what sort of polity can become effectual for their due order and regulation. If they are principally made up of the spiritual, holy, and regenerate, they can be best regulated by a Church authority, which is spiritual in its nature and sanctions merely. But if they are composed chiefly of

the wicked and unregenerate, nothing can constrain them but outward coercion. We acknowledge most freely that the polity of the Reformed Churches generally, and of the Congregational in particular, is based on the supposition of visible holiness and internal grace, according to the judgment of charity, in all their members. They suppose those Christian graces, that spiritual wisdom and understanding, that quick sense of obligation, propriety, order and decency, in spiritual things, that mutual fellowship in virtue of a common union to Christ, that humility and tenderness, that delight in divine things, and foretaste of heavenly joys, that conscientious fear of God, and serious apprehension of his final judgment, to belong experimentally to the mass of their members, which are the peculiar gifts of the Holy Spirit, and constitute a susceptibility, a meetness for this mode of Church government above any other characterized by an extraneous dominion over their consciences and religious liberties, and consisting in an extensive earthly jurisdiction, state, pomp, and power of outward compulsion. On this system, the order of the house of God, the beauty of holiness, and vigorous evangelical discipline, purging out all offences and corruptions, develope themselves with spontaneous ease and gracefulness, as the living products of the Spirit of truth and grace, inhabiting, harmonizing, cementing the whole body, in and through each of the particular members, thereby quickened and guided to do their various duties toward themselves and each other. From an oversight of this only basis of an evangelical Church state, many have been betrayed into the imagination, that some more extended, sovereign, central authority is needful for the subjection of Churches to a proper regimen. This is the stronghold of prelacy and papacy. Our author encountered this objection in a great variety of forms. And he always demolished it at a single stroke, thus; those Churches for which the gospel system of government is inadequate are so far forth not gospel Churches. And further, any order which a more despotic system may produce in such Churches is not an order which is the vital fruit of the indwelling spirit, producing that faith which works by love, and infusing into it the life, beauty, and glory of the gospel; but it is a dead form without the power of Godliness, a mechanical performance of certain ceremonies, constitutes that lifeless shadow of order and unity, which in a true gospel Church,

we see working really, vitally, and spiritually in that love which is without dissimulation, and a dutiful, hearty submission to their God and King, beholding whose face, they are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of our God. We freely confess that the Congregational and Presbyterian systems will not compensate for the lack of grace and godliness in a Church. On the decay of all religion, sound doctrine, spiritual wisdom and gospel love, they will be accompanied with contention and disorder, and in such cases, no new Church polity is wanted, but reformation, whereby the existing polity may be rightly administered. Hence, it is a point of capital importance, that lively stones only be used to build up a spiritual house acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Let us hear our author :

“Whereas regeneration is expressly required in the gospel,* to give a right and privilege unto an entrance into the Church and kingdom of Christ, whereby that kingdom of his is distinguished from all other kingdoms in and of the world, * * * it cannot consist in any outward rites, easy to be observed by the worst and vilest of men. * * *

“Of this regeneration baptism is the symbol, the sign, the expression, and the representation.† Wherefore unto those who are in a due manner partakers of it, it giveth all the external rights and privileges which belong unto them that are regenerate, until they come unto such reasons, wherein the personal performance of those duties whereon the continuation of the estate of visible regeneration doth depend, is required of them. Herein if they fail, they lose all privilege and benefit by their baptism.

“So speaks the apostle in the case of circumcision under the law ; Rom. ii. 25. For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law ; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. It is so in the case of baptism. Verily it profiteth if a man stand to the terms of the covenant between God and his own soul. * * * If he do not, as in the sight of God his baptism is no baptism, as unto the real communication of grace and acceptance with him ;‡ so in the sight of the Church it is no baptism, as unto a participation of the external rights and privileges of a regenerate state.

* John iii. 3. Tit. iii. 3—5. † John iii. 5. Acts ii. 38. 1 Pet. iii. 21.

‡ Phil. iii. 18, 19. Tit. i. 15, 16.

"God alone is judge concerning this regeneration, as unto its internal real principle and state in the souls of men,* whereon the participation of all the spiritual advantages of the covenant of grace doth depend; the Church is judge of its evidences and fruits in their external demonstration, as unto a participation of the outward advantages of a regenerate state,† and no further." pp. 33, 34, 35.

We shall now quote his views in regard to the Church state of baptized infants. We cannot discern what title to a participation of the Lord's supper and other outward privileges of the Church, belongs to such as, being old enough to 'discern the Lord's body,' if they were truly regenerate, live in allowed sin, and 'deny the Lord that bought them.' Indeed, we see not what materials can properly go to the composition of a Church, besides those visibly, and in the judgment of charity, regenerate, without opening the gate for the entrance of the openly profligate and licentious into the fold of Christ. In the decay of true religion, manifold avenues are always opened for the reception of the unholy. When men lose their spiritual discernment, they are abandoned to carnal policy, and act according to the wisdom of this world. They count upon numbers rather than character, quantity rather than quality; the size, popularity, and temporal resources of the Church, rather than its spirituality. Such expedients always issue in the decline and extinction of pure religion, as does all exaltation of the wisdom of men above the authority of God. The operation of the *half-way covenant* in New-England, the state of religion in all Churches in which baptism, on whatever pretext, is treated as regeneration, is a confirmation of these assertions. We do not see how any person who has any acquaintance with religion, or regard for its interests, can entertain the slightest objection to an examination of candidates for admission to the Church, as to their personal piety. Nay, we see not how they can fail to approve and adopt this course, much less how they can assail it with jest and ribaldry. By any other process, the Church is robbed of its spirituality and glory, and we are more in the way of building synagogues of Satan, than Churches of our Lord Jesus Christ.

As to the project of filling Churches in this way, and then purging them by discipline, it is so visionary and im-

* Acts xv. 8. Rev. ii. 23. † Acts. viii. 13.

practicable, that we wonder how any rational man can entertain it. Prevention is easier and better than cure. It is far easier to keep out unworthy persons from the visible Church before they are in it, than to get them out when once there. Besides, to excommunicate persons for things which do not bar admission, is the height of injustice. Moreover, it is vain to think that a company of irreligious persons will expel themselves, or persons like themselves. But we will not go farther into a subject which has been well and fully treated in a former No. of this Journal by Dr. Pond. As to the grounds of judging who are fit to be members of the visible Church, our author judges; (1.) That persons living in habitual sin are unfit. "To compose Churches of habitual sinners, and that either as unto sins of commission or sins of omission, is not to erect temples to Christ, but chapels to the devil." (2.) Persons who not being habitual sinners, have yet committed any scandalous offence, which, were they in the Church, and repented not of it, would effect their excommunication, if they remain obstinate and impenitent, are unmeet to be admitted to the Church. (3.) "They are such as visibly answer the description given of gospel Churches in the Scriptures, so as the title assigned therein unto the members of such Churches, may on good grounds be appropriated unto them." (4.) "They must be such as make an open profession of the subjection of their souls and consciences unto the authority of Christ in the gospel, and their readiness to yield obedience unto his commands. To suppose such a confession of the Christian religion to be compliant with the gospel, which is made by many who openly 'live in sin, being disobedient, and to every good work reprobate,' is to renounce the gospel itself. Christ is not the high priest of such a profession." He considers it requisite to a due making of this confession, (1.) "That there be a competent knowledge of the doctrines and mystery of the gospel, especially concerning the person and offices of Christ. * * * The first instruction which he gave unto his apostles was, that they should teach men by the preaching of the gospel, in the knowledge of the truth revealed by him. * * * So Justin Martyr tells us what pains they took in those primitive times, to instruct those in the mysteries of religion, who, upon a general conviction of its truth, were willing to adhere unto the profession of it. And what was their judgment herein, is sufficiently known from their keeping a mul-

titude in the state of catechumens, before they would admit them to the fellowship of the Church. We think there is occasion in these days for pausing a moment at this stage of our quotations to call special attention to this qualification for making a Christian profession. The sentiments it expresses, must commend themselves to all persons of any insight into the nature of religion, or the proper materials for composing a Church. When pure religion decays, the principle gains ground, that a man's goodness is wholly irrespective of his belief, and that it matters not what his opinions are, if his life is only right. This is the crutch on which infidelity and heresy, as if conscious of their inherent lameness, instinctively lean. Any reader of Bellamy's writings, will see how it was inwrought into that whole system of error, which he was raised up to batter down; one of the heads of the Hydra, which as they successively sprung up, he smote mortally with his Herculean club. No matter what a man's belief is. Unbelief of the divine testimonies is the damning sin of the world. Men disbelieve them because they hate them. "They hate the light, and will not come to the light because their deeds are evil." Rejection of the doctrines of Scripture implies hatred of them, and this feeling is not only *un-Christian*, but *anti-Christian*. This is eternal life, to know God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. Religion is no blind tumultuous impulse; no unintelligent and unintelligible tempest of emotions about the eternal world: it is a most clear, full, calm view, approbation and love of the divine perfections and glories, as they are unfolded in his word, and shine forth in that mediatorial system which is therein revealed. This system is supernatural, and positively revealed, and can be drawn from no source but the fountains of divine inspiration. "The world by wisdom knew not God." "The foolishness of God is wiser than men." Consequently, to be Christians is to receive and delight in those views of God, and of his ways, dealings and requirements, which are set forth in the Bible. To reject and abhor the truths which justly set forth God, according to the Scriptures, is to hate the God of the Bible, and his method of salvation by God in Christ. Conversion is not a mere reformation of life and manners. It is repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. What God, and what Christ? A fabulous or imaginary being, such as Heathens, Deists, Infidels, Universalists, Socinians, Pelagians

Arminians feign? Or is it not the God and Saviour of the Scriptures, who hath said 'thou shalt have no other gods before me?' Hence, all Christ's true disciples take the yoke and learn of him.' They subject their natural reason, conscience, will, preconceived opinions and predilections, to his guidance. To reject or deny what he teaches, is to reject and deny him. Accordingly, intelligently to fight against an ambassador of Christ faithfully preaching the truths of his word, is to fight against Christ himself. It is an infallible mark of his true sheep that they *hear his voice, and a stranger they will not follow*. Now in order to a cordial reception and love of the doctrines of the cross, that divine illumination which always accompanies regeneration is indispensable. God must shine into the mind, giving a knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ; "For the natural man discerneth not the things of the Spirit, neither indeed can he, for they are spiritually discerned." A rejection of the truths of the gospel then is proof of an unregenerate state. Persons of this stamp, may perform many external duties, and possess the moral virtues which are in high repute among men. So may Deists and Infidels. But they are unbelievers, and therefore 'the wrath of God abideth upon them.' Hence, so far as the religion of Jesus Christ is concerned, whatever may be true of rationalism, or heathenism, it is impossible to separate a man's goodness from his belief, or from the principles on the faith of whose truth he orders his life; for it consists wholly in right apprehensions and right feelings towards the truths supernaturally revealed in the Bible. Hence, we are taught 'that all Scripture is profitable for doctrine.' Thus the truth of Owen's observation respecting the proper manner of professing religion becomes apparent. "The knowledge therefore belonging unto the profession is itself to be professed."

We do not conceive that in these days, the length and particularity of these remarks are uncalled for, or that they are aimed at a phantom of our own imaginations. We are quite sure that the present wide spread decay of spiritual and experimental religion, and the vast increase of formality and unfruitfulness in our churches, is in a great measure owing to the practical adoption of the principle, that, it is no matter what one's doctrine is if his heart is only right; as if the heart could be right which hates the truth of God! And we are well persuaded that the present luxuriant

growth of Pelagianism began in a neglect to be careful of the doctrines of candidates for the Church, which arose out of an exclusive concern among ministers to promote awakenings, revivals, and an increase of hopeful Christians, when a general soundness of doctrine quieted all solicitude as to their genuineness. The next step was to new model all the doctrines, so as to produce the greatest possible amount of excitement about religion. Then Pelagian sentiments were openly and elaborately defended in high places. And now that latent hostility to the Scriptural system, which is congenial to the human heart, and which in the best time always lies smothered in the Church, was emboldened to manifest itself. Thus busy was Satan in sowing tares while men slept; and before the Church was awake even to the suspicion of danger, a vast party was organized hostile to those doctrines, and that manner of religion, which are vital to her purity, peace, yea, her very being.

The vigorous maintenance of Scriptural truth alone will preserve the purity of revivals of religion, and purge away false and fanatical excitements. They are like chemical tests, that determine the quality of the substance to which they are applied. Like the refiner's fire they consume the dross, and detach the gold in its native purity and brightness. A false excitement will wither instantly before the declaration of sound doctrine. We have heard of a great excitement dying away instantly, in consequence of a single sermon delineating the great features of evangelical religion. We have seen a tremendous stir in religion suddenly chilled by a single discourse of a truly Scriptural stamp. Pure revivals gather interest and solemnity from the most full and unsparing exhibitions of divine truth, and decline as soon as they are deprived of their proper nutriment. That fiery tempest of fanaticism, which has well nigh spent its force, and which but yesterday disgorged its fury upon our churches in a flood of spurious converts, of extravagance, disorder, confusion, anarchy, impiety and blasphemy, from which, if they obtain a final deliverance, they will not wholly recover in this generation, would have been dissipated in a moment by lucid exhibitions of sound doctrines, as the mists are chased away by the sun. But the prophecy, "the time shall come when they shall not endure sound doctrines; but after their own lusts will they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears

from the truth and shall be turned unto fables," was fulfilled in this case with a literal exactness rarely paralleled. And as is the tree such are the fruits now witnessed.

It is obvious that without that uniformity of doctrine, and harmony respecting the nature of true religion and religious experience, which are impossible in a church that does not make substantial agreement with its own views a condition of membership, discord and contention must soon arise. The unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace will be marred or broken in that company which is not made one, by having one faith, one Lord, one baptism, one God and Father of all. There is no other possible basis of fellowship, and let men speculate as they please, there is none provided in the Bible but that of speaking the truth in love, and mind- ing the same things. The breaches in particular churches, and throughout entire communions, now occurring over the whole land, are standing testimonies to this truth.

We believe therefore that the prosperity of Zion urgently demands increased care of the doctrinal belief and knowledge of the candidates for admission to the church. Thus alone will she be built up of gold, silver and precious stones, instead of wood, hay, stubble. That church, which for some temporary aid, receives to its communion a body of persons who are either strangers or enemies to the truths of the gospel, is laying a train of heresy, discord and confusion, which it may never be able to arrest, till the light of God's truth and vital piety are extinguished for ever.

Returning from this digression, we recount the other qualifications for making a profession, which our author specifies. These are, (2.) "A professed subjection of the soul and conscience unto the authority of Christ in the Church."* (3.) "An instruction in and consent unto the doctrine of self-denial and bearing the cross in a particular manner. For this is made indispensably necessary by our Saviour himself, unto all that will be his disciples."† (4.) Conviction and confession of sin, with the way of deliverance by Jesus Christ, is that answer of a good conscience, that is required in the baptism of them that are adult." (5.) "Unto this profession is required the performance of all the known duties of religion." (6.) "A careful abstinence from all known sins."

* Matt. xviii. 18. 20. 1 Cor. viii. 5- † Matt. x. 37. 39. etc.

We think the following not inappropriate to these days. "And herein we are remote from exceeding the example and care of the primitive churches, yea, there are but few, if any, that arrive to it. Their endeavor was to preach unto all they could, and rejoiced in the multitudes that came to hear the word. But if any did essay to join themselves unto the church, their diligence in their examination and instruction, their severe inquiries into conversation, their disposing of them for a long time into a state of expectation, for their trial, before their admittance, were remarkable. And some of the ancients complain that their promiscuous admittance of all sorts of persons that would profess the christian religion, into church membership, which took place afterward, ruined all the beauty, order, and discipline of the church." pp. 360, 361.

One would imagine that the author had in his eye some of the improvements introduced into many American churches within the last twenty years. On another page he observes, that as religion became exempt from persecution, and the profession of it was rendered honorable, "the care and diligence of the churches about the admission of members were in a great measure relinquished or forsaken. The rulers of the church began to think that the glory of it consisted in its numbers; finding both their own power, veneration and reverence increased thereby." This makes the parallel between ancient and modern degeneracy perfect.

(To be Continued.)

ART. X.—REVIEW OF DR. OWEN ON INDWELLING SIN IN BELIEVERS.

THE title we have chosen almost demands an apology. Has not the subject, which it indicates, been of late extensively banished from pulpits reputedly orthodox? Does it harmonize with the general taste and movement of the religious public? The abettor of modern improvements in theology will indignantly ask, Why attempt to revive a forgotten dogma of past centuries? Why harrass the enterprising young disciple with gloomy and chilling views of his imperfections? Others will express their amazement that

any man, in the nineteenth century, should have the hardihood to divert attention, in the smallest degree, from the wide-spread, enormous evils, which will not cease from the earth without the united and earnest endeavors of all Christians.

To others, however, we trust not a few, it will seem neither ill-timed, nor of doubtful utility, to bespeak a serious consideration for a topic which enters into the very essence of the Christian calling ; especially as it is our purpose to do little more than furnish quotations from the profound treatise of Owen which bears the above title. In former years this work ministered not a little to that serious, solid piety, which, in many churches, now appears "ready to vanish away." In "many temptations and afflictions," the author felt constrained to publish his views on this subject, for reasons which might now be urged with almost equal truth. "The effects and fruits of it (indwelling sin) which we see in the apostacies and backslidings of many, the scandalous sins and miscarriages of some, and the course and lives of the most, seem to call for a due consideration of it."

It was the practice of Owen to "reason out of the Scriptures." Accordingly, in support of the views entertained in the tract before us, he appeals to Romans, vii. 21 ; "I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me." In common with the great body of evangelical commentators and divines, from Augustine to our own times, the author entertained no doubt that in the latter part of this chapter, Paul speaks of a regenerate person. We are aware that some professedly Calvinistic writers have, of late, adopted that view of the passage which Pelagians and Arminians have always labored to establish. With what success they have fortified their interpretation from the resources of criticism, theology and experience, this is not the place to inquire ; but that their mode of expounding the passage is adapted to delude the impenitent and to perplex real saints, we cannot doubt. In the tract styled, "Paul not carnal," the perfectionists claim, in defence of their main proposition, the reasoning of these critics upon the passage in question, and some acute minds are at a loss to know how the claim will be set aside.

And here, before proceeding to the views of Owen, it is proper to remark, that Professor Stuart, of Andover, in the first edition of his commentary on Romans, alleged, that

Augustine at first applied chap. vii. 14—25 to the unregenerate, but afterwards recanted this opinion in the heat of dispute with Pelagius. Shortly after the appearance of this statement, one of our leading journals furnished, in respect to the change of Augustine's views, the testimony of Neander, confessedly the first ecclesiastical historian of this age, from which it is certain, that several years before Augustine heard of Pelagius, his own religious experience led him to apply these expressions of Paul to true believers. It remains to be known on what grounds the second edition of the commentary repeats the gross and injurious misrepresentation, which had been thus publicly exposed.

To return to Owen: he "takes that for granted which may be undeniably proved and evinced, namely, that it is the condition of a regenerate person, with respect unto the power of indwelling sin, which is there proposed and exemplified, by and in the person of the Apostle himself. 'I find then a law, &c.' 'Now that which we observe from this *name*, or term of a *law*, attributed unto sin, is, that there is an exceeding efficacy and power in the remainder of indwelling sin in believers, with a constant working towards evil. Thus it is with believers; it is a law, even *in them*, though not *to them*. Though its rule be broken, its strength weakened and impaired, its root mortified, yet it is a *law* still, of great force and efficacy.' 'I find then,' or therefore, '*a law*.' He found it; it had been told him there was such a law, it had been preached unto him. But it is one thing to know in general that there is a law of sin, and another thing for a man to have an experience of the power of this law of sin in himself. For a man to find his sickness, and danger thereon, from its effects, is another thing than to hear a discourse about a disease from its causes."

The general frame of believers, notwithstanding the inhabitation of this law of sin, is here also expressed. "They would do good. The habitual inclination of their will is unto good. This law *in* them, is not a law unto them, as it is to unbelievers."

"This, in their *worst* condition, distinguishes them from unbelievers in their *best*. The *will* in unbelievers is under the power of the law of sin. The opposition they make to sin, either in the roots or branches of it, is from their light and consciences; the *will of sinning* in them is never taken away. 'Take away all other considerations and hinderances

and they would sin willingly always. But in believers there is an habitual disposition and inclination in their wills, unto that which is spiritually good."

"And here lie the springs of the whole course of our obedience. An acquaintance with these several principles, and their actions, is the principal part of our wisdom. They are, upon the matter, next to the free grace of God in our justification by the blood of Christ, the only things wherein the glory of God and our own souls are concerned. These are the springs of our holiness and our sins, of our joys and troubles, of our refreshments and sorrows. It is then our concernment to be thoroughly acquainted with these things, who intend to walk with God, or to glorify him in this world."

"And hence we may see what wisdom is required in the guiding and management of our hearts and ways before God. Where the subjects of a ruler are in feuds and oppositions one against another, unless great wisdom be used in the government of the whole, all things will quickly be ruinous in that state. There are these contrary principles in the hearts of believers, and if they labor not to be spiritually wise, how shall they be able to steer their course aright?"

Having evinced the propriety of calling sin a *law*, on account of its efficacy, as an inbred, active evil, which still struggles for dominion; holding out its pleasures for rewards on the one hand, and for punishments on the other the difficulties that attend evangelical obedience; the author summons attention to the alarming advantages which it has on account of being an *indwelling law*.

"It always abides in the soul, it is never absent. The apostle twice useth the expression, "it dwelleth in me." There is its constant residence and habitation. If it came upon the soul only at certain seasons, much obedience might be perfectly accomplished in its absence. Yea, and as they deal with usurping tyrants, whom they intend to thrust out of a city, the gates might be sometimes shut against it, that it might not return. The soul might fortify itself against it. But the soul is its home; there it dwells and is no wanderer. Wherever you are, whatever you are about, this law of sin is always in you; in the best that you do, and in the worst. Men little consider what a dangerous companion is always at home with them. There is a living coal continually in their houses, which, if it be not looked unto, will fire them,

and, it may be, consume them. An inmate may dwell in a house, and yet not be always meddling with what the good man of the house hath to do. But it is so with this law, that it will be present with us in every thing we do. Would you pray? would you hear? would you give alms? would you meditate? would you be in any duty acting faith on God and love towards him? would you work righteousness? would you resist temptations? This troublesome perplexing indweller will still, more or less, put itself upon you, so that you cannot perfectly and completely accomplish the thing that is good."

"This law of sin adheres as a depraved principle unto our minds in darkness and vanity, unto our affections in sensuality, unto our wills in a loathing of, and aversion from, that which is good; and by some, more or all of these is continually putting itself upon us, in inclinations, motions, or suggestions to evil, when we would be most gladly quit of it."

"It hath a great facility and easiness in the application of itself unto its work. The soul cannot apply itself to any duty of a man, but it must be by the exercise of those faculties wherein this law hath its residence. Is the understanding or the mind to be applied to any thing? there it is ignorance, darkness, vanity, folly, madness. Is the will to be engaged? there it is also, in spiritual deadness, stubbornness, and the roots of obstinacy. Is the heart and affections to be set on work? there it is in inclinations to the world, and present things, and sensuality, with proneness to all manner of defilements."

The sighs and tears of the "little flock" who pant after perfect conformity to the divine will, bear witness to the fidelity with which Owen, here as elsewhere, portrays the characteristics of "the old man which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts." After making such spiritual attainments as rendered him in truth a burning and a shining light, Augustine confessed:

"I am poor and needy, and my best method is, to seek thy mercy in secret groans, and in self-abhorrence, till thou perfect that which concerneth me. My wholesome griefs and pernicious pleasures contend together, and I know not on which side victory stands. Who is me! Thou art my physician; I am sick. Thou art merciful; I am wretched; all my hope lies in thy immense mercy. Give what thou commandest, and command what thou wilt."

May it not with reason be asked, whether the general strain of preaching at the present day, as it seldom and lightly touches the remaining corruptions of believers, does not fail to promote, as it ought, true Christian edification? Is it not notorious that the thorough, skillful developement, to the people of God, of the destructive maladies which still cleave to their spirits, is rarely attempted by numbers who are solemnly charged to "take heed unto the flocks over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers?" Whence this fundamental defect in the ministrations of so many pastors? In some cases, no doubt, the cause is to be sought in the preacher's own want of gracious affections. "Many at that day shall say, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name?" to whom he will reply, "I never knew you."

"It is a dreadful thing," said Baxter, "to be an unsanctified *professor*, but much more to be an unsanctified *preacher*. If such a wretched man would take my counsel, he should make a stand, and call his heart and life to account. He should fall a preaching awhile to *himself*, before he preach to others any more. He should consider whether a wicked preacher "shall stand in the judgment, or a sinner in the assembly of the just?" When such thoughts as these have entered into his soul, and kindly wrought upon his conscience, I would advise him next to go to the congregation, and there preach over Origin's sermon on Psalm l. 16, 17; "But to the wicked God saith, what hast thou to do, to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldst take my covenant into thy mouth, seeing thou hatest instruction, and hast cast my words behind thee?" When he has read this text, I would have him sit down, as Origin did, expound and apply it by his tears."

In other cases, theological error will account for the alleged defect. Unscriptural views of native depravity tend strongly to this result. If the unregenerate have such ability as some claim for them, it is evident that believers need no extraordinary aids to complete their sanctification. These teachers are not likely to be so inconsistent as to dwell with much earnestness on the dependence of true Christians, and the necessity of their watching unto prayer. If the enemy, when in full strength, may be conquered with comparative ease, why represent him as dangerous after a stronger than he has overcome him, and taken from him all his armor? Accordingly, that perfect sanctification is attainable, and has actually been attained by many saints in the

present life, is boldly taught by some who stand in the front rank of modern theological reformers.

Others, less bold, or less thoroughly imbued with the new divinity, feel its influence to such a degree, that spiritual, searching discourses directed to the church are rarely brought out of their treasures. That portion of their flocks, who still make serious business of cultivating the "graces of the Spirit," notwithstanding the downward tendency of the times, complain that their pastors do not aid them in their conflicts with bosom sins. They hear little respecting the power and deceitfulness of remaining corruption, and the divine succors appointed for those who "live the life that now is, by faith on the Son of God."

A recurrence to the treatise of Owen will show, that in whatever way the deficiency in question may be accounted for, it endangers the vital interests of genuine religion.

"The strength of the law of sin is enhanced by the two leading properties of the heart in which it resides.

"1st. It is unsearchable. We fight with an enemy whose secret strength we cannot discover, whom we cannot follow into its retirements. Hence, oftentimes, when we are ready to think sin quite ruined, after a while we find it was but out of sight. It hath covers and retreats in an unsearchable heart, whither we cannot pursue it.

2d. It is deceitful. Who can mention the treacheries and deceits that lie in the heart of man? It is not for nothing that the Holy Ghost so expresses it, "It is deceitful above all things;" uncertain in what it doeth, and false in what it promiseth. And hence, among other causes, it is, that, in the pursuit of our war against sin, we have not only the old work to do over and over, but new work still, while we live in this world; still new stratagems and wiles to deal withal, as the manner will be where unsearchableness and deceitfulness are to be contended with. There is no way for us to pursue sin in its unsearchable habitation but by being endless in its pursuit. It may be under some great affliction, it may be in some eminent enjoyment of God, in the sense of blessed communion with Christ, we have been ready to say, that there was an end of sin, that it was dead and gone forever. But have we not found the contrary by experience? Hath it not manifested that it was only retired into some unsearchable recesses of the heart, as to its in-

being and nature, though it may be greatly weakened in its power."

"This law of sin, so active and so strongly entrenched, has properties the most appalling, only one of which is considered by the author: "It is enmity against God. As it is enmity, every part and parcel of it, the least degree of it that can possibly remain in any one, is enmity still. It may not be so effectual and powerful in operation, as where it hath more life and vigor, but it is enmity still. As every drop of poison is poison, and will infect, and every spark of fire is fire, and will burn, so is every thing of the law of sin, the last, the least of it, it is enmity, it will poison, it will burn. Mortification abates of its force, but doth not change its nature. Grace changeth the nature of man, but nothing can change the nature of sin. When a man hath enmity itself to deal withal, nothing is to be expected but continual fighting to the destruction of one party. If it be not overcome and destroyed, it will overcome and destroy the soul. It is never quiet, conquering nor conquered. It is in vain for a man to have any expectation of rest from his lust but by its death; of absolute freedom, but by his own."

"Some seek for quietness by laboring to satisfy their corruptions. 'Making provision for the flesh to fulfill the lusts thereof.' This is to aslake fire by wood and oil. You cannot bargain with the fire to take but so much of your houses; you have no way but to quench it."

"The 'actings and operations' of this inward foe confirm all that has been affirmed respecting its power. 'Power is an act of life, and operation is the only discoverer of life.' 'When I would do good evil is present with me;' that is, to hinder me, to obstruct me in my duty, because it abhors and loathes the thing which I have in hand, it will keep me off from it if possible. Unless the hand of God in his Spirit be high and strong upon the soul, even when convictions, sense of duty, dear and real esteem of God, and communion with him have carried the soul into its closet; yet if there be not the power and vigor of spiritual life constantly at work, there will be a secret loathness in them unto duty, yea, sometimes there will be a violent inclination to the contrary. And here hath been the beginning of the apostacy of many professors, and the source of many foolish sensual opinions. Finding this aversation in their minds and affections from

closeness and constancy in private spiritual duties, not knowing how to conquer and prevail against these difficulties through him who enableth us, they have at first been subdued to a neglect of them ; first partial, then total ; until, having lost all conscience of them, they have had a door opened to all sin and licentiousness, and so to a full and utter apostacy. If the least loose liberty or advantage be given unto indwelling sin, if it be not perpetually watched over, it will work to a strange and unexpected issue."

"The mind, the most spiritual part of the soul, hath its lusts, no less than the sensual appetite. Hence it is, that when the soul is oftentimes doing as it were quite another thing, engaged quite upon another design, sin starts that in the heart, or the imaginations of it, that carries it away into that which is evil and sinful. Yea, to manifest its power, sometimes when the soul is seriously engaged in the mortification of any sin, it will, by one means or other, lead it away into a dalliance with that very sin whose ruin it is seeking, and whose mortification it is engaged in. But this enmity rests not there, it cannot rest ; it urgeth, presseth and pursueth its purposes with earnestness, strength and vigor, fighting, and contending, and warring to obtain its end and purpose."

"Now if it be so, that grace hath the sovereign power in the understanding, will and affections, whence is it that it doth not always prevail, that we do not always do that which we would, and abstain from that which we would not ? Is it not strange that a man should not do that which he chooseth, willeth, liketh, delighteth in ? Is there any thing more required to enable us unto that which is good ? But here lies the difficulty, in the entangling opposition that is made by the rebellion of this law of sin. Neither is it expressible, with what vigor and variety sin acts itself in this matter. Sometimes it proposeth diversions, sometimes it causeth weariness, sometimes it finds out difficulties, sometimes stirs up contrary affections, sometimes it begets prejudices, and one way or other entangles the soul, so that it never suffers grace to have an absolute and complete success in any duty."

"It also rebels in respect unto particular duties. Woful entanglements do poor creatures meet withal upon this account. Take an instance in prayer. Instead of that free enlarged communion with God that they aim at, the best

that their souls arrive unto is but to go away mourning for their folly, deadness and indisposition."

"Enemies in war are restless and importunate. So is the law of sin. Doth it set upon the soul? Cast off its motions, it returns again; rebuke them by the power of grace, they withdraw for a while, and return again. Set before them the cross of Christ, they do as those that came to take him; at the sight of him they went backwards and fell unto the ground, but they arose again and laid hands on him. Sin gives place for a season, but returns and presseth on the soul again. Reproach it with its folly and madness, it knows no shame, but presseth on still. Let the thoughts of the mind strive to fly from it, it follows as on the wings of the wind. And by this importunity it wearies and wears out the soul. There is nothing more marvellous nor dreadful in the working of sin, than this, of its importunity. The soul knows not what to make of it; it dislikes, abhors, abominates the evil it tends unto, it despiseth the thoughts of it, hates them as hell, and yet is by itself imposed on with them, as if it were another person, or an express enemy got within him. I do not say that this is the ordinary condition of believers, but thus it is often when this law of sin ariseth up to war."

"Now of all things in our condition, there is nothing so suited to teach us to walk humbly and mournfully before the Lord, as the vile remainders of enmity against God which are yet in our hearts. It may be, some who are wise and grown in other truths may yet be little skilled in searching their own hearts, that they may be slow in the perception and understanding of these things. But this sloth and neglect is to be shaken off, if we have any regard unto our own souls. Would other professors (besides hypocrites) walk with so much boldness and security as some do, if they considered aright what a deadly watchful enemy they continually carry about them and in them?"

We cannot forbear to extend our extracts from this searching author a little further, though at the hazard of being tedious to some readers, because we believe that his deep views of evangelical truth and Christian experience must be inculcated again, with solemnity and force, before the piety of our churches will recover a healthy tone. We cannot assent to the opinion, often avowed of late, that the gospel ministry fulfils its chief design in the conversion of

sinner. One of its noblest ends is, "the perfecting of the saints;" "the edifying of the body of Christ;" "a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." It were easy to demonstrate, by undeniable facts of recent occurrence, how preposterous is the attempt to gain these objects by expatiating on the power of the Church, and enforcing all sorts of duties except the mortification of sin. How many sermons have issued from the press, within twenty years, with such titles as "*The Real Christian*," "*A Higher Standard of Holiness*," the true object of which is, to press larger contributions from the Church, or to urge on in some way the vast complex machinery intended for the reformation of the world. To stimulate those just entering on a religious life with glowing representations of the splendid achievements which the Church expects of them on the open field of benevolent enterprise, is, no doubt, less difficult than to lay open the unsearchable and baneful corruptions of the heart; but is it equally scriptural and safe?

Under "the captivating power of sin," our author remarks, that "success is the greatest evidence of power, and leading captive in war is the height of success. The apostle treats not here of our being captivated unto this or that sin, but unto the law of sin. This leading captive manifests our condition to be miserable and wretched. To be thus yoked and dealt withal, against the judgment of the mind, the choice and consent of the will, how sad is it. When the neck is sore and tender with former pressures, to be compelled to bear the yoke again, this pierces, this grieves, this even breaks the heart. What more dreadful condition? Hence the apostle cries out, as one quite weary and ready to faint."

"Sin riseth up in the heart, is denied by the law of grace, and rebuked; it returns and exerts its poison again: the soul is startled, casts it off, it returns again with new violence and importunity; the soul cries out for help and deliverance, seeks round about to all springs of gospel grace and relief, trembles at the furious assaults of sin, and casts itself into the arms of Christ for deliverance."

"The great wisdom and security of the soul in dealing with indwelling sin is to put a violent stop unto its beginnings, its first motions and actings. Venture all on the first attempt. Die, rather than yield one step unto it. Hadst

thou not brought up this slave delicately, it would not now have presumed beyond a son."

"The *deceitfulness* of the law of sin is seen in its efforts to divert the mind from a due apprehension of the vileness, abomination, and danger of sin. It separates between the doctrine of grace and the use and end of it. This is the trial and touchstone of gospel light. If it keep the heart sensible of sin, humble, lowly and broken on that account; if it teach us to water a free pardon with tears, to detest forgiven sin, to watch diligently for the ruin of that which, we are yet assured, shall never ruin us, it is divine, from above, of the Spirit of grace. If it secretly and insensibly make men loose and slight in their thoughts about sin, it is adulterate, selfish, false."

"A stable, solid, resolved mind in the things of God, not easily moved, diverted, changed nor drawn aside, a mind not apt to hearken after corrupt reasonings, or pretences to draw it off from duty; this is that which the apostle exhorts believers unto; 1 Cor. xv. 58."

"The power of indwelling sin is "demonstrated by the effects it hath had in the lives of believers; and that too in men not of an ordinary size, but higher than their brethren by the shoulders and upwards in profession, yea, in real holiness. Such were Noah, David, Hezekiah, and others. And surely that must needs be of a mighty efficacy, that could hurry such giants in the ways of God into such abominable sins as they fell into. An ordinary engine could never have turned them out of the course of their obedience. It was a poison that no athletic constitution of spiritual health, no antidote could withstand."

"An habitual declension from first engagements unto God, from first strictness in duties and obedience, is ordinary and common among professors. How is it with the best? Are not almost all grown cold and slack? Were not their souls solicitous about the interest of Christ in the world, like Eli's about the ark? Did they not "contend earnestly for the truth once delivered to the saints," and every parcel of it? And do now the generality of professors abide in this frame?"

"To see men living under and enjoying all the means of spiritual thriving, yet to decay, not to be fat and flourishing, but rather daily to pine and wither, this argues some secret powerful distemper. This is indwelling sin."

"The end of all communications of grace and supplies of life from the living Head is the increase of the whole body, and every member of it, and the edifying of itself in love. His treasures of grace are unsearchable, his stores inexhaustible. His life, the fountain of ours, full and eternal; his heart bounteous and large, his hand open and liberal. Whence then is it that they do not all flourish and thrive exceedingly?"

"Indwelling sin oftentimes prevails to the stopping of the springs of gospel obedience, by false and foolish opinions corrupting the simplicity of the gospel. False opinions are the works of the flesh. From the vanity and darkness of the minds of men, with a mixture, more or less, of corrupt affections, do they mostly proceed. The apostle was jealous over his Corinthians in this matter; he was afraid lest their minds should "by any means be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." Hence John cautions the Elect Lady and her children to take heed they were not seduced, "lest they should lose the things that they had wrought." We have innumerable instances hereof in the days wherein we live. And as this is done grossly and openly in some, so there are more secret and plausible insinuations of corrupt opinions, tainting the springs and fountains of gospel obedience, and through the vanity of men's minds getting ground upon them. Such are all those that tend to the extenuation of special grace, in its freedom and efficacy, and the advancement of the wills, or the endeavors of men, in their spiritual power and ability: they are all the works of the flesh, and howsoever some may pretend a usefulness in them to the promotion of holiness, they will be found to taint the springs of true evangelical obedience, insensibly to turn the heart from God, and bring the whole soul into a spiritual decay."

On rising from the perusal of Owen's work, we are confirmed in the belief, that a disproportionate share of effort is at present devoted to the correction of political wrongs and open vice. Thousands are running to and fro, hot in their zeal to rid the world of the "grapes of gall," by attacking the clusters themselves; while few adopt the more certain method of aiming a mortal blow at the master root.

This treatise also renders very manifest the folly of "trusting in man and making flesh our arm," for the support of the great interests of religion. Our most trusty leaders have not altogether quelled the motions of the flesh. The

subtle poison of indwelling sin still lurks in the eloquent preacher and the accomplished divine.

In the following mournful testimony of Baxter, too many living witnesses must concur. "Truly the sad experiences of these times have much abased my confidence in man, and cause to have lower thoughts of the best than sometime I have had. I confess I look on man as such a distempered, slippery and inconstant thing, that as I shall never more call any man on earth my friend, but with the supposition that he may possibly become my enemy, so I shall never be so confident of any man's fidelity to Christ, as not withal to suspect, that he may possibly forsake him. Nor shall I boast of any man's service for the gospel, but with a jealousy that he may be drawn to do as much against it."

ART. XI.—PHRENOLOGY.

PERHAPS some of my readers may remember a very well-dressed, tall, dark looking gentleman, who has been frequently seen, the past season, walking up and down Broadway near the Astor House. There was something so remarkable in his looks as well as his air and manner, that he became the object of no ordinary degree of interest, and as no one was acquainted with his name, he was generally known by the designation of "the man in whiskers." His gait was remarkably erect, and his countenance exceedingly grave and solemn; he sometimes wore an air of deep abstraction and sometimes of severe and laborious thought. His eyes were generally a little raised, and it was evident that they were fixed on none of the objects about him. His thoughts must have been intently employed on very high and interesting subjects, or it might have been supposed that the beauty and fashion of Broadway must sometimes have called them down from their lofty elevation. But though nothing had sufficient attraction to arrest his attention, the man in whiskers himself was an object of universal interest. The ladies bestowed upon him glances which might have gone far to unpoise his philosophy could they but have been seen. How they came to take so much interest in this stranger has

always been a mystery. He certainly seemed to have few of the qualities which are usually held in much estimation among them. His hat was evidently set some degrees from the fashionable cock. He had not the martial flourish of the cane and the look of defiance, his coat had not the rich gloss, nor his gloves, pantaloons and boots the exquisite fit which are so sure to affect the female heart. For myself, as I am unwilling to suppose that the fair sex ever lavish their admiration except on a suitable and sufficient object, I have had no difficulty in tracing his power to an immense pair of dark bushy whiskers, which had been suffered to extend themselves till they had almost concealed the features of his face. Nature seemed to have fairly exhausted herself in producing this enormous excrescence, and his whole countenance, on a near inspection, seemed to be exceedingly lean and shrivelled. This luxuriant harvest of hair had been so curiously trimmed and disposed as to form two very graceful arches, the first under his chin, the second under his nose. This last appendage did not as is usual bend down over his mouth like the trunk of the elephant, but had taken a contrary direction and curved gently backwards like the horn of the rhinoceros. All my inquiries respecting this remarkable individual have always been unsuccessful, and the most that I could ever gather was an obscure report, that he was some distinguished philosopher, who had purposely sequestered himself from society in order to have more leisure to pursue his speculations in retirement.

Just before the last departure of the Great Western, as I was sitting by my fire, the door was suddenly opened, and the man in whiskers abruptly entered. The suddenness of the visit, together with the character of the visitor, I must confess somewhat discomposed me. But before I had crossed my room to reach him a chair, he had vanished as abruptly as he entered. On returning to my chair I found he had left a small package containing some loose sheets of manuscript, together with a letter, which last I shall now proceed to lay before my readers.

Sir—After a long and laborious search among those that have charge of the public press, I think I have found in you, at least, that quality which has been the object of my search, and which I prize above all price. I mean a love of truth for its own sake. This, together with the sympathy which always subsists between congenial spirits, has induced me to

make you the depository of my history, and also of a treasure of whose value the world little dreams, and which I fear has been kept too long concealed from it.

From my very earliest years I have been actuated, I may rather say tormented with a parching thirst for knowledge. The decided bent of my inclinations was soon discovered and seconded by my friends, who gave me opportunities for the acquisition of science which have fallen to the lot of very few. My own zeal and industry disposed me to make the most of my advantages, and before the age of twenty-five I had made acquisitions which were the envy or the admiration of all my associates. But alas, how deep was my infatuation! I was valuing myself on trifles, I was a stranger to all true knowledge, I knew not that science of sciences, which sheds its light through all the rest and gives them all their value. I knew not phrenology. About this time, a happy accident for which I shall ever be grateful, brought me into the society of the great Diagoras. By this divine philosopher, I was instituted into the principles of true science. From this time you may be sure I have toiled to some purpose. I have heaped up knowledge by handfuls. I have gathered up the facts which lie scattered every where with more ardor than the miser does gold. I have attended the lectures of my great master in every important city in the union. No expense has been spared in the collection of busts, books and skulls. But the grand fountain of light in this science is the examination of living heads. Here I will say it, and say it without vanity, my labors have been surpassed by none. I have undertaken distant and expensive pilgrimages to examine the heads of distinguished individuals. I took one journey to measure the destructiveness of Gen. Jackson, another to gauge the combativeness of Blackhawk, a third to ascertain the secretiveness of Oseola. I have also visited the most celebrated menageries in the country, to examine the heads of different animals, and have succeeded in tracing the whole history of their manners and habits to their several cerebral developments.

As the happiness of the governed is so closely connected with the character of those who make and execute the laws, I have felt a great interest in knowing something of the dimensions of the brains that govern us. To this end I have spent several winters in Washington, and taken an exact measurement of the skulls of most of the distinguished men

who make any figure in Congress. These I value, and shall preserve as the most important and authentic materials for history. I can furnish the precise size of the firmness of Webster, the benevolence of Clay, the cautiousness of Van Buren, the adhesiveness of Adams, the secretiveness of Kendal, and the conscientiousness of Blair.

I have reason to flatter myself, that my stay at the Capital has not been without its use to the country, and that phrenology has already become a useful handmaid to politics. For several years past, I have been employed by the heads of departments to gauge the adhesiveness of every candidate for any important public office, and so great has been the estimation in which my skill has been held by our most distinguished men, that none have been able to succeed in their applications till they have obtained from me the requisite testimonials in their favor; and to the honor of phrenology be it said, that not one of these worthies has brought suspicion on its great principles.

It has always been a maxim with me, that principles are the children of facts; for this reason I have been unwearied in my industry to amass the largest possible treasure of these last, satisfied that they would eventually produce the desired offspring. Indeed, I have not been at all particular about the source provided they could but be obtained. I have constantly frequented our police courts, and I will add, that I have found them the most favorable places to cultivate a science of the human mind. By frequent examinations of criminal organizations, I have become so familiar with them that I pronounce upon the case on an examination of the head, with nearly the same confidence, as the judge from an examination of the witnesses. In fact, we most usually coincide. In our state prisons, myself and many of my brethren have seldom failed to detect the true crime for which a convict was committed, by tracing it to a mal-conformation of the head.

I have said, that I have always been determined to follow facts, believing that they would eventually lead me to principles. I had for a long time been convinced that they were all pointing one way, that I was on the track of some great principle which was to be of essential service to mankind, and I have now the happiness to inform you that that principle is discovered, and I hereby present it to you. It

is this, that all our evils both public and private, are the result of bad cerebral organization. In short, Mr. Editor, I have discovered that which philosophers have always sought and never found, the origin of evil; and what is of still more importance together with the sources of diseases, I have no manner of doubt that I have also discovered the true remedy. I now proceed to lay before you the brief sketch of a plan for the entire extirpation of vice and misery from the world. I have myself no manner of doubt of its perfect feasibility, and believe that it will be attended with much less labor and expense than some of our projects for internal improvements. You may remember that the ancient Spartans had a custom of subjecting every infant to a certain examination before it was formally received into the commonwealth. If the child were found to have such a constitution of body as would make him a burden to himself and others; above all, if there seemed not to be promise of sufficient strength to endure the fatigues of war, they suffered him to perish. This though a cruel, was a useful institution; it raised up a nation of philosophers and warriors, and perhaps exalted man's physical and intellectual system to the highest pitch to which it was ever raised.

Now mine, though a similar, is a perfectly humane institution. I propose that as soon as a child is born, it be immediately brought before a jury of phrenologists, who shall be sworn to examine his head according to the most approved principles of their science. In case they give their certificate in its favor, then it shall be immediately adopted into the commonwealth. But should they find it possessed of a miserly, sensual, or ruffian head, such a one that, under the ordinary temptations of human life, would make the person a source of mischief and corruption to others, and, by propagating his like, would taint the next generation, in this case, that the person be formally excommunicated from the commonwealth, which certainly has a right to elect its own members. The different sexes of these convicts are to be kept in separate institutions, and never permitted to associate together; they are to be furnished with wholesome food and constant employment, and always subjected to the vigilance of keepers whose business it shall be to see that they do one another no injury. This would save to the unhappy individuals all the guilt which they would otherwise amass, and save to the community the expense of courts,

jails, judges, juries and lawyers. Moreover, in two or three generations, I have no doubt that it would entirely remove the mal-conformations, which, through ignorance of the laws of nature have been suffered to accumulate for centuries. In short, we might soon drive vice and misery quite out of the world, and bar the door for ever against their re-admission.

This great work has engrossed my thoughts for several years, and I intend that the rest of my life shall be wholly devoted to it. I have lectured, written, visited, journeyed and corresponded, and at last begin to see my efforts crowned with success. We have determined to make use of a voluntary association till legislatures can be brought into the scheme, and a few benevolent individuals who shall be nameless, have formed ourselves into a society for the immediate abolition of vice and misery from this earth. I have always been ambitious of enrolling my name among the philanthropists and reformers who have graced the present age in such numbers, and should I succeed in fairly putting things in a train to remove all evil from the world, I shall feel that I have not been wholly useless in my generation, and hope mankind some day or other will look upon me as their benefactor.

I am now on my way to Europe, to form similar societies abroad. I have also a commission from certain men who profess to be in the secrets of government to measure the firmness of Queen Victoria. I have also been requested by a young virtuoso to visit Westminster Abbey, and to ascertain some points in the character of certain English kings, upon which history has been silent, by an examination of their skulls themselves.

Mr. Editor, I am now coming to the point for which I have been all along preparing you. During the life of the great Diagoras I took copious notes of certain of his lectures and conversations which were not trusted to an ordinary audience, but were reserved for the ears of those who had been more fully initiated into the mysteries of the science. It was his dying charge, that these should be published as soon as the public mind should be able to bear them. That time I fancy has now arrived, but alas, business of the utmost urgency calls me away, and I am obliged to devolve the important work on you. Should you accept the trust, your answer will be directed to the address which I have placed below. Should you——

After examining the manuscripts of the man in whiskers, and making them matter of mature deliberation, I have concluded to admit them. I confess that nothing has weighed with me more than the decided partiality of my readers to very short articles. Men are gifted with the quality of patience in very different degrees. Some will hardly find their way through a discussion of five pages, some will even get very well through ten or fifteen, but I have found very few who can pass over twenty-five or thirty, without stopping once or twice to refresh themselves, and recruit their spirits. Should this plan of short essays meet any favor, I shall be inclined frequently to adopt it.

LECTURE 1.

Young Gentlemen :—You who have arrived at some just knowledge of the true principles of phrenology, may have been surprised at hearing us making use of the words God, soul, and duty ; you may have wondered how we could speak in such high terms of the Bible in our more public lectures, and even quote it ; and perhaps you have been led to divine the true cause. The fact is, we owe some respect to the prejudices of the mass of the people, and we have some apprehensions from the influence of their blind attachments to long received opinions.

The truth is, mankind have always shown an unaccountable malice towards their benefactors. Galileo, Newton, Harvey and Jenner were all, in some way or other, persecuted for the most magnificent and useful discoveries, and I have not a doubt, but that if most of our lecturers on phrenology should be imprudent enough to expose their true views, without any ambiguity, before a promiscuous assembly, that they would be more likely to be turned out of doors than to receive the praise and admiration which their ingenuity usually secures to them. It is for this reason that we communicate the more important secrets of the science to those only who show a sincere thirst for true knowledge, together with a noble superiority to vulgar prejudices.

You are to understand, that there prevail among us two theories as to the nature of the human mind. I shall first describe that which I believe to be the true one, which is by far the more general, and indeed is embraced by all who

have penetrated at all into the depths of the science. I shall then unfold and attempt to overthrow the second.

Phrenology originated in the researches of an accomplished anatomist. He had observed that every important function in the human body was performed by some curious organ, admirably adapted to the end. He knew that the liver secretes the bile, that the stomach digests the food, that the heart propels the blood, and he was surprised that no important function had ever been attributed to the brain. Setting himself down to conjecture, it occurred to him, that as the brain is evidently the most important organ, and thought the most important action which takes place in the system, that the brain might be the organ of thought. This sudden light filled his mind with ecstasy, and he soon proceeded to demonstrate the theory, which he accomplished in the following manner. Nature has formed no important organ in vain. The brain is an important organ, and if it do not think, there is nothing else for it to do; therefore, the brain must be the organ of thought. Having thus discovered the great organ of thought, it was comparatively easy to determine the location of its different faculties.

The great fundamental principle of phrenology is, *that there is no spiritual substance distinct from the body.* But yet, as it is evident that it is the brain alone which thinks, perceives and feels, there is some difference among us as to the proper definition of man. Some are inclined to believe that the brain alone is man; others take the spinal marrow, nerves and ganglions also into the definition; but most extend it to the whole body. We all agree with Moses, who has taught us that man was formed out of the dust of the ground, and we are now pretty unanimous in the opinion, that he is nothing but a lump of dirt, somewhat smaller than the elephant, but larger than the dog, and organized for higher functions than either. But strictly speaking, the brain is not a single organ, but a congeries of organs, and it is the great object of phrenology to distribute among these organs all the various mental phenomena of which we are conscious.

A phrenologist will tell you precisely by what organ every particular mental operation is performed. For instance he will point you to one organ by which a man loves his children, a second by which he loves his money, houses and lands; a third by which he loves his wife; a fourth by which he esteems himself; a fifth by which he loves roast

beef, or rather, as there is no thinking substance distinct from the brain, he will tell you what part of it thinks, what part perceives, what part loves, and what compares and judges.

You will perceive by this skull that the science has arrived almost to perfection: we have already got the skull almost completely laid out into faculties, and if metaphysicians keep up the practice of discovering new faculties in the human mind every year, phrenologists will be sadly puzzled how to find room for them.

Having described to you the theory of the most scientific and respectable, and by far the most numerous class of our philosophers, I will proceed to give you the system which is embraced by a few individuals who choose to style themselves phrenologists, but who are held in more contempt by us than even the genuine spiritualists.

These men believe that there is in man a spiritual substance distinct from the body. They suppose that the brain itself does not think more than the liver or the stomach, but that its only office is to assist the mind either to think or else to manifest its thoughts.

Do you see, young gentlemen, what principles these enthusiasts have admitted into phrenology? First, here is a thinking spiritual substance as distinct from the body as it is from the moon; then it has all its faculties inherent in itself, so that the convolutions of the brain are no more organs of thought than the folds of the stomach: then it is this substance alone that performs all its appropriate functions, and the brain can no more be said to think and feel and perceive, than it can be said to digest the food or propel the blood. Now I say this is a denial of the fundamental principles of phrenology. It overturns all our favorite positions.

If once we admit that thought and feeling are not the properties of matter, or of any particular state or organization of matter; if it be as really a property of mind to reason and feel, as it is of matter to be hard or soft, round or square, then it is destroying all conceptions of this substance, and absolute absurdity to suppose that it needs the aid of material organs to perform its own appropriate functions, to exert its own inherent faculties. If the mind itself possesses the faculty of thought, pray what assistance does it need from the brain, and if the brain does not possess this faculty, how is it to yield this assistance? As well might the ass attempt to assist the nightingale in singing.

Once convince men that there is a spiritual substance distinct from the body, and you can never persuade them that it needs the assistance of matter in order to exhibit its distinctive properties; and once concede that a spirit may think without a brain, and you introduce angels; yes, and there may be a God for aught we know, and once introduce a God and you overturn phrenology from its very foundations. What would nine-tenths of our converts give for phrenology, provided it taught the existence of a God? They would about as soon receive the Bible and catechism. Convince one half of our adherents that there is a God who sees them, who has always been watching them, and will hereafter bring them into judgment, and you frighten the very life out of them; you strike at the very foundation of their hopes, and poison their pleasures at their very source.

Besides, once admit the existence of a spiritual substance which possesses within itself the faculties by which it is fully able to perform certain operations, and who will believe that it has need of any foreign assistance to perform such acts? You make no more of phrenology than the Pelagians do of grace; the brain only assists the mind to do a work to which it is fully competent without aid.

Admit the existence of a thinking mind, and you make phrenology absolutely unphilosophical; you introduce a cause fully adequate to all the effects for which you are to account, and then suppose that another cause has some share in their production; you do more, you admit a cause which you allow actually produces these effects. You in fact deny that this new cause has any share in the production of these effects, for you allow that it is the mind alone which thinks, feels, and reasons, and that the brain no more performs such acts than the stomach or lungs. Now what aid does the mind receive from this assistant, when it performs all the work itself? Once persuade people that they have a thinking mind that has faculties for every mental operation within itself, and they will instantly scout the idea of cerebral organs.

If the brain cannot think and reason, it is capable only of certain changes in the qualities or positions of its particles; and pray what assistance could such changes in a soft and pulpy mass be supposed to afford a spiritual mind in seeing that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two

right ones? how could they be supposed to help the man to love his children himself or his kind?

If you give up the idea that the brain actually affords the mind any assistance in thinking, and say that its action however must precede that of the mind, the question arises, what moves the brain? You trace all acts to the brain as the first cause, and you may as well dispense with the other. If you teach that all the mental acts have their source in the action of matter, you might as well teach that they are in fact the action of matter. Phrenologists would have little objection to this sentiment, but they well know that if an immaterial mind be admitted, that such a principle can never gain a footing.

Some have been absurd enough to suppose that the mind performs all mental acts, but that certain changes in the brain result from them, which have no resemblance to thought, and have pretended to call this phrenology. The truth is, it is absolute spiritualism. All the old theologians have been ready to admit a mutual sympathy between the mind and body. They supposed that the brain, when in health, acted as a kind of scapement, and in some mysterious way kept the motions of the intellect steady; that when diseased the mind itself sympathised in its disorder, but they never believed that the convolutions of the brain were organs of mind.

Some who deny that the brain even assists the mind in thinking, nevertheless assert that it helps it to manifest its actions. We all indeed use this language before promiscuous assemblies, but no genuine phrenologist ever thought that the brain did no more than merely help the mind to manifest its actions. To whom does it manifest them, pray? Not to ourselves, for we are the mind, and need not, on this theory, the help of a dull mass of dirt to make us conscious of our own acts. The fact is, this consciousness constitutes the acts themselves. If it be meant that the brain makes our acts evident to others, we reply so does the whole body forsooth.

Now to what do the principles of these pretended phrenologists amount? Why that the brain no more thinks than the stomach: that those organs which our philosophers have taken so much pains to discover and describe, do nothing that any more resembles thinking and reasoning than the secreting of the bile or the propulsion of the blood. It is

an abuse of language to call them organs. In short, they do not make out that they even serve to manifest thought. In fact they tear up the science by the very roots. They have wholly mistaken the objects of the science.

Phrenology contents itself with investigating merely the agent and the organs of thought. It does not attempt to describe and reason upon the mental acts themselves; this is the province of a perfectly distinct science. It matters not whether mental acts have their source in the brain or a thinking mind; they can be known only by consciousness, and a metaphysician may have consciousness in as high perfection as a phrenologist. In fact, many have cultivated this faculty of consciousness with even more success than phrenologists. Was it not by consciousness without one particle of phrenology that Dr. Emmons discovered that mankind had always been in a blunder in supposing they had a will or heart? Did he not demonstrate to a whole generation that there was no such thing in nature? Did not Dr. Taylor, by diligently cultivating the same faculty of consciousness, discover the permanent voluntary purpose, and prove its existence to half the ministers in Connecticut? Did not this same gentleman discover from consciousness that all religion is nothing more than the love of self? Did not Dr. Beecher, by mere consciousness, discover the will again after it had been lost full forty years? Did he not search the depths and ransack the dark corners of his mind till he had found a second will, to which he has given the name of the power of contrary choice. This gentleman has succeeded in such a surprising manner in cultivating consciousness, that I have no manner of doubt that, not content with the glory of discovering two wills, he will yet find a third, should the necessities of his system ever require it.

Has not Dr. Fitch, without the least aid from phrenology, demonstrated that to predicate holiness or sinfulness of man in distinction from his actions, is blasphemous and absurd in the highest degree? Are not these men shocked to hear holiness ascribed to angels, or sinfulness to devils, as such? Has not this gentleman proved to general satisfaction, that sinful actions express no moral attribute of the mind in which they originate? Have not the New-Haven students, without a particle of phrenology or theology even, proved to sinners the truth of these glad tidings, and have they not repented by hundreds on the spot? Have not the New-Ha-

ven divines, without any assistance¹ from our science, been laboring with unwearied pains to convince men that propensities to sin, if any such exist, that propensities to sin are not sinful propensities ; and are not thieves, gamblers, sots and villains beginning to rejoice in the glorious truth ? Do they not quote the authority of these divines to prove that all their inherent propensities are constitutional, and that every passion or disposition which belongs to human nature is innocent ? In short, have not Dr. Beecher and the New-Haven divines formally set up their consciousness against revelation, and taught that no doctrine of the Bible is to be received which opposes it ? Let phrenology then be content with its own province ; it has nothing to do with consciousness : the New School divines will manage that without our aid. Both sciences are fast coming to the same results, and will soon establish the same great principle.

Perhaps, young gentlemen, some of you may have become weary by the length of this discussion, but I have serious apprehensions from the laxness of these new principles in phrenology, and could not say less. I will barely notice another theory and close. It is this. That a very subtil, material soul inhabits and actuates the body. This theory takes away, it is true, all manner of importance from the brain, but then it attributes all mental operations to organized matter. But what need, pray, that matter should be so refined and attenuated in order to think and feel ? Our best anatomists think they see in the formation of the brain an organization as admirably adapted to thinking, as exists in the heart for propelling the blood. Succeeding philosophers beyond doubt will penetrate still further into the secret of its mechanism ; and I have no doubt, that when chemistry and mechanics shall make a few farther advances, that an artificial brain may be constructed which will reason on all the great points of religion and politics, with far more justice than the mass of the community do at the present day.

LECTURE II.

It has been the great fault of our systems of mental philosophy that they have always been so abstruse, that not one in a thousand has understood them, and this, notwithstanding all the ingenious abridgments and illustrations which certain late writers have composed to bring the subject down

to common capacities. Here is a human skull which you see is laid out into small rectangular lots. This, gentlemen, presents you at one view with a map of the whole science ; here you have the exact extent and boundary of every faculty, and a little Miss may learn mental philosophy about as soon as the map of Rhode Island.

These little bumps are caused by the faculties or organs underneath, and are considered the proper representatives of them. You may have been puzzled to divine how the soft convolutions of the brain should have so pushed out the several parts of the skull, when the hardest knocks from the outside scarce make any impression. This is not done by a miracle. The truth is, the skull receives its general shape from which it never deviates very perceptibly, when its parts are more soft and pliable than the brain itself. The skull may be compared to the crust of an apple pie in its soft state ; it is spread over the faculties, and having taken their exact shape and impression, it gradually hardens till it forms a complete cover and protection for them, and at the same time helps the phrenologist to all that goes on within as exactly as the dial plate does of the interior movements of a clock.

Man possesses an indisputable superiority over other animals ; he evidently stands at the top of the scale of organized matter. In acquisitiveness, destructiveness, amativeness and alimentiveness, he is vastly superior to any creature that has yet been discovered ; and if he be surpassed in firmness by the mule, in gravity and veneration by the owl, in cautiousness by the fox, in secretiveness by the cat, yet it may be safely asserted that he possesses more of these qualities, and in a higher degree than any single individual of them all. This we shall demonstrate from a comparison of their several cerebral convolutions.

Observe, young gentlemen, we consider all men's passions and propensities as equally the gifts of the bountiful giver of every blessing, we regard them all as equally good. Destructiveness and combativeness, are equally as virtuous as benevolence ; and conscientiousness is on a level with acquisitiveness, for they are only the actions of certain material organs. Like the new divinity, phrenology admits of no sinful propensities. The old divines used to talk of envy and hatred, and malice, and revenge, and a long list of hateful attributes ; we say with the new-schoolmen, that it is un-

philosophical to predicate sinfulness to any attributes of the mind ; and besides, after all our searches into the brain, we have never been able to find the organs of such feelings. It makes no matter whether a man's integrity have its source from conscientiousness or cautiousness, whether his charities flow from benevolence or from approbateness, whether he befriends his kind from a desire for their good, or a desire for their praise. You are to know, that as we deny to him the faculty of will, he must act just as these propensities and passions propel him ; he has nothing else to move him ; and having no will, he cannot choose which to follow, or whether to follow any.

Mankind have always been prone to idolatry. Where they get their singular notions about a will is more than I know, but no heathen ever paid a more blind worship to his wooden god than civilized nations pay to this chimera of a will. Phrenologists care not whether a man be actuated by his propensities or by mere mechanical force ; there is no more good or evil in one than in the other ; and as for a will which is said to govern the propensities, it is evident that this could be no more than a mere physical attribute of the mind, and its acts no better or worse than those of the propensities themselves. But, young gentlemen, of one thing you may be assured ; that if such an attribute had belonged to man, the phrenologists who have looked over his head so many years would most assuredly have discovered it. But all legislation forsooth must be built on the supposition of the existence of this chimera, and civil courts must inquire in every action, whether it were voluntary. It would have been better for grave law-makers first to have sat down and inquired whether there be such a thing in man as a will. The best anatomists have never been able to discover one, and how should these novices have come to a knowledge of it ? We find in man no such thing ; he takes the direction of his passions and propensities as necessarily as chaff does the course of the wind.

It is true, that in our public discourses to promiscuous audiences, we are obliged to accommodate ourselves to the vulgar notions. We have no objection to the name, provided you do not introduce the thing. For this reason, as we can find no single faculty that at all resembles that attribute, we have concluded to give the name to a combination of them. Some call the intellect the will, others have

thought that it would be more proper to give that appellation to the general strength of the propensities ; but one thing is pretty certain, if every faculty yet discovered is quite distinct from it, as is the fact, no combination of them whatever can constitute the chimera. The truth is, man is in no higher sense voluntary in his actions than the brutes ; he has no more will than a weathercock.

You see now why so much depends on a proper balancing of the passions and propensities : as there is no will to control them as the spiritualists dream, their relative size determines the character, and is the true key to all the decisions of the phrenologist. "The relative developments of consciousness and acquisitiveness in Bishop's head," says an eminent phrenologist, "are such that he would have no difficulty in lying, perjury and cheating, in every way for gain, and his small combativeness agrees with his character for a sneaking villain, an arrant coward." A writer in the *Edinburgh Phrenological Journal*, commenting on the above and other *ruffian heads*, says, "he has seen several hundreds in England and Ireland, and on the continent, and states the general prevalence of this combination among them to be so obvious and certain, that criminals require only to be looked at, after acquiring sufficient skill in observation, to give rise to an irresistible conviction of our unfavorably formed brain, being a constant concomitant of naturally vicious dispositions. The *vast majority of criminals* belong to this class." Here, young gentlemen, is the skull of the excellent Sir Matthew Hale, and here is another of Johnson, the murderer. We are accused of making no difference between virtue, vice, of destroying all moral distinctions. I will now measure the distance from destructiveness to destructiveness in each, and demonstrate the distinction before your eyes. Do you see the difference ? a good three quarters of an inch, gentlemen. We make a real, palpable distinction, and not a mere abstract definition, a distinction in the men themselves, and not in their actions merely. The truth is, gentlemen, virtue and vice are not mere metaphysical subtleties, but substantial and real existences. They are nothing more nor less than proportioned or disproportioned cerebral development.

It is indeed become too fashionable to represent phrenology as confounding all moral distinctions ; but the truth is,

that never was reproach more unfounded. We not only allow the difference between good and bad actions, but we trace them to a difference in the men themselves, and can point it out so that every child can see it. Don't we trace all virtue and vice to cerebral organization? Don't we prove the truth of our science, by deciding the character of men by the shape of their heads? Don't a phrenologist always hit upon character much better than a modern biographer? Don't we show the difference in the very men themselves? Is there not a class of men who get their living by this? Don't we, in state prisons, tell the very crimes of the convicts by the shape of their skulls? Have we not demonstrated, from phrenology, that the will has nothing to do in man's acts; that, in fact, there is no such thing; that their course is shaped and may be predicted by the structure of the brain? The New Haven divines allow a difference between virtue and vice, but utterly deny any difference between the virtuous and the vicious; they consider it as shocking and blasphemous to believe that mental actions express any quality of the agent. We are willing to make this difference; we say that it exists in the brain itself, and as this charge against us has been so extensively propagated, I deem myself excusable in devoting the remainder of this lecture to its refutation by pointing out the true distinction between virtue and vice. You are aware that we admit no mental action, unless we find its organ in the brain. The only reason why we believe in the existence of virtue and vice, is that we find the organs of them on the skull itself; and if we are able to produce these, I suppose we may be exonerated from all the charges of our enemies.

Murder, "the organ which gives the disposition to kill." or as it is now more fashionably termed, destructiveness, is clearly one of the most important gifts with which the benevolent Creator has endowed the human mind. "We find that the destruction of animals by animals, has always been the order of nature." Four successive races of animals have already disappeared by this means, from the earth, and were it not for the superior developement of cautiousness in men; had they not combined to direct their depredations on lower animals only, they would probably have eaten themselves out of the world some centuries ago. "The organ is always large in cool deliberate murderers, such as Agnes Clark and Bellingham, also in Gottfried, who murdered

both her parents, her children, two husbands and six children." "See the size in Hare, who assisted Burke to murder sixteen persons for the sake of selling their bodies for dissection." But the organ itself is as important as that of benevolence. To have left man without this organization "would have been any thing but an indication of wisdom and beneficence." But it may be said, do these cases of malefactors prove that God has given men an organ which gives them a disposition to kill each other? Would not this prove murder to be innocent, or according to the will of God? You are now prepared to understand the true nature of the distinction of virtue and vice. "A disposition to kill is not sinful any more than benevolence or any other sentiment in the mind of man; they are all, it is clear, the mere effects of organization. A disposition to kill does not necessarily lead to murder; it may be held in check by some other propensity equally the result of organization; but as we have nothing but these propensities and sentiments, and no will distinct from them to control the strong and cultivate the weak, it is perfectly clear that the strongest party must rule, as it does in every well ordered community; and if it lead to virtuous actions, we consider it a virtuous organization; if to vice, a vicious one. Virtue and vice are nothing but the relative strength of the several organs. Murder may be held in check by strong cautiousness, strong philoprogenitiveness, or by benevolence or conscientiousness, it matters not which. Where God has given a child a strong propensity to kill, the parent, if a phrenologist, might inform him of the fact; not scare him, however, but simply assure him that it is a law of his nature and put him in a course calculated to strengthen his other propensities. There is infinite mischief from not knowing a child's disposition at his first setting out in life.

A murderous disposition, then, is far from being hateful or sinful. It would be the height of blasphemy to assert this, for God has organized man for murder as really as he has the ox for labor; his design can be read in the structure of both. He has designed, however, that this principle should be placed under certain restrictions; for which reason he has planted certain other propensities which act as antagonist principles. Columbus, from a bare survey of the map of the globe, conjectured that there must be some western continent to balance the eastern. Dr. Gall reasoned in much the same manner in discovering philoprogenitiveness,

the great antagonist principle to murder. He had been surprised at the fact, that a helpless being thrown into the hands of two persons who were organized for murder, and had a delight in it ; that this little creature who could make no resistance, and was moreover a constant source of trouble, care, vexation and expense, should almost uniformly escape ; that with every opportunity and inducement, and even a strong propensity to kill it, the parents should so generally spare it. The sagacious philosopher suspected that there must be some reason for this. He set himself to search for the cause, and in 1803 discovered the faculty of philoprogenitiveness. It was discovered on the head of a noted pick-pocket. The fellow had acquisitiveness in only an ordinary degree, and yet pursued his calling with such astonishing activity, that the Dr. was suspicious that there was more than one propensity at work, and on inquiry, learned that the fellow was supporting a helpless family by his industry. This established the existence of the faculty, and all succeeding observations confirmed the conclusion. We have already remarked that where the organ of murder is very large, crime is most generally the result ; the other organs in fact are too weak for it. In philoprogenitiveness, on the contrary, crime is almost invariably the result of the deficiency of the organ. " In twenty-nine women who committed child-murder," says a distinguished phrenologist, " twenty-five had the organ very small," and we may add that in the rest of these women the other organs were more than a match for philoprogenitiveness. If men then have an organization which fits them for murder, they have a still stronger one which disposes them to take care of their children, and this excess of benevolent organization we call virtue ; its opposite is vice.

Self-esteem is a passion to which, at first sight, we should be disposed to say there was no antagonist ; but yet it has several powerful ones. Though the feeling be evidently the result of organization, yet we are heartily ashamed of it, and anxious above all things to conceal it. Its antagonist is approbateness, or a love of the praise and applause of others, a thirst for fame and distinction. Self-esteem withers instantly under the influence of this last feeling. Few men would have the hardihood to tell what goes on in their own breasts. I believe most would prefer to stand in the pillory rather than be compelled to give an exact history of

all the vain-glorious thoughts and foolish schemes of self-exaltation which have passed through their minds in the course of three weeks. Self-esteem disposes a man to exalt himself; it is the organ of pride, vain-glory and haughtiness. "Two men," says a distinguished phrenologist, "with large self-esteem and equal pretensions will be natural enemies." 'This organ is the source of private animosities and national wars, the parent of endless crimes. It has been known to keep most of Europe in a bloody war for a quarter of a century. We share the organ with the lower animals. It is large in horses and authors, in turkeys and dandies, in belles and peacocks. It is exceeding well developed in the heads of the English, and still better in our countrymen. It has one antagonist as I said, in approbateness, a second in conscientiousness, and still a third and stronger in cautiousness.

Of all the great antagonist organs of the brain, cautiousness is the most important. Conscientiousness is rarely well developed; but this is rather prominent in almost every head that I have ever seen.

The truth is, cautiousness and secretiveness prevent ten crimes where conscience does one: and where they cannot prevent crime, they are pretty sure to prevent detection, or at least to obviate the consequences. These two are also the great springs of success in most human enterprises. "Cautiousness," says a phrenologist, "leads us to provide the direct means of defence. Secretiveness *excites to arts of stratagem, concealment and deception.*" These qualities are found in a high degree in dogs, cats, foxes and politicians.

Sometimes two passions get so equally matched as to remain for some time in equilibrio. Spurzheim tells a pleasant anecdote of an old lady in whom acquisitiveness and conscientiousness existed in such exact proportions that she regularly stole a neighbor's goose one night, and carried it back the next; and this the conscientious old creature kept up for a considerable time.

Young gentlemen, I most thoroughly abhor that theory of Phrenology which will not admit that the passions are the general result of organization as much as motion is the result of machinery with a force applied. On any other principle it is absolute nonsense to call murder or self-esteem organs. To say that the brain is only an organization for manifesting thought and feeling to others, is to allow that thought and feeling exist without it, and previous to its

action, if it be said that it manifests them to us, I ask if we are distinct from ourselves? if we are not conscious of our own thoughts and feelings, but need a third person to manifest them to us?

Dispositions to murder, to conceal and deceive, to hoard, to pride, haughtiness and self-exaltation, a thirst for praise, for fame and honors, are all innocent, for they result directly from organization, and may be counteracted by each other. But where these organs are so proportioned to each other, as to lead to vicious results in the conduct, we call the man vicious; where they lead the person to a course of conduct which makes him a good citizen, we call the organization virtuous. A phrenologist can distinguish virtue from vice in a moment; he will come nearer to a person's true character than his neighbors; for a man may conceal himself; circumstances may prevent the true developement of his character; but the head gives the character of the organs themselves. I recollect that the moment I cast my eye on the head of the great Dr. Heavystern, I told him instantly he was an everlasting thief. His friends exclaimed at my presumption, for the Doctor really bore a very irreproachable character; but those who have examined his learned works have assured me, that I was not far from the truth on either side.

LECTURE III.

The subject of the present lecture is the application of the principles of phrenology to practice. I shall examine the skulls of several distinguished individuals, then the head of a lady, afterwards that of a clergyman.

Here, young gentlemen, is the cast of the head of Judas Iscariot, taken from a very accurate likeness of him by St. Luke, who you know was a painter.

Champollion taught us to decipher the ancient inscriptions of Egypt, and has thus let us into its history and antiquities. But Dr. Gall has taught us to read a language which exists every where; he has taught us to decipher the inscriptions on the human skull, which, however ancient, are never obliterated, and contain an exact history of the individual, intellectual, moral and physical. The moral qualities of Iscariot appear about as plain to a practised eye in the above cast as they do to an ordinary reader in the Evan-

gelists. Do you see that large bunch, gentlemen, just above the ear? That is the organ of acquisitiveness. Now look a little back; the organ of adhesiveness is scarcely visible. A phrenologist could have told at once how he would act when a reward was offered for his master. The author of our holy religion knew him it appears but too well. The adhesiveness of one or two of our distinguished countrymen, as well as several other of their organs, too much resemble that of Iscariot. "Conscientiousness, when too large," says a very able phrenologist, "produces excessive remorse and self-condemnation." You perceive that this organ has a prodigious development here, and it no doubt hastened on his unhappy end. He brought back the thirty pieces of silver, and went away and hanged himself. Now-a-days those who have betrayed any great interest or party, manage to adhere to their money if they have been obliged to abandon their principles.

But here, young gentlemen, is the skull of a man without any conscience at all. It belonged to the great land and lot speculator, G. R. There is not the smallest trace of the organ. In my life I have examined the heads of some hundreds of this class, and could never succeed in detecting it in any; on the contrary, I have often found a remarkable depression where the faculty should be located.

A pleasant fellow of this class, who had a deep concavity here, told me I must be mistaken about his conscience, that he knew that he had one when he first set out in business, because it used to gall him prodigiously; he thought that in the hurry of some of his bargains, his conscience might have got turned bottom upwards, which explain the phenomenon of the cavity without supposing the absence of the organ; he says, that in future he shall call his a concave conscience.

The moral sentiments are placed in a very exposed situation on the head, and nature takes care gradually to uncover them when they may be supposed to be fully ripe. But since phrenology has come into vogue, many very worthy men are much afraid of this exposure. The price of wigs, I am told has very sensibly risen within the last six years. I think I have detected a concave conscience on a gentleman, who wore his own hair, at a distance of at least thirty feet.

This, gentlemen, was the head of the author of a new

sect in Theology. I have seen the casts of quite a number of these men, and they all bear a considerable resemblance to each other. I wish you to look at it carefully. It would puzzle any thing less than a phrenologist. You see the intellect is remarkably small, not one of the faculties well developed. We must look for the secret of his success elsewhere. Do you see that bunch on the back of the head, which projects out like a young horn? That is the organ of self-esteem. Don't you remark how it has encroached on the neighboring organs? absolutely absorbed veneration and benevolence, and fairly obliterated conscience? This, together with immense secretiveness, was the whole mystery of his influence and success.

It is a very interesting task for one who has a taste for philosophy, to apply the principles of phrenology to the different classes and professions of men. I could, if disposed, make a great many very interesting disclosures on this subject.

In the clergy, of late, I speak particularly of the younger part of them, I begin to find conscientiousness very small, and secretiveness prodigiously large. In fact I have never found so good a secretiveness in any thief or pickpocket as is very often seen on the heads of very eloquent young men. In truth, among the elder orthodox divines, I begin to find cautiousness much better developed than conscientiousness.

In looking over the heads of our great modern philanthropists, I have promised myself a perpetual feast. I have taken pains to seek them as promising the most choice and beautiful specimens of all the higher moral sentiments. But alas, how have I been disappointed! In the abolitionists, for instance, I expected an immense benevolence and conscientiousness; but in all that I have examined, I could never detect even the existence of these organs. I have found nothing remarkable about them but large destructiveness and excessive combativeness. I would not however assert that the other two organs do not exist, but only that I have never yet been able to find them. Destructiveness and combativeness, you know, are very formidable qualities where they are well developed; and it seems to be a wonderful provision of Providence that organs from which the community have so much to fear, should be kept so busily at work in behalf of the poor slave: that principles which might find their employment in demolishing prisons and

warehouses, in pulling down banks or interrupting legislation, should find sufficient occupation in worrying a poor editor, removing a helpless clergyman, or breaking up a feeble congregation.

Madam, by your leave, I will now proceed to a careful examination of your head. You will excuse me from communicating the result to you at present. Many of my remarks would be unfit for an audience composed like this of males and females. I shall therefore pen them on paper, together with the exact measures of your organs, and hand them to you for your private inspection—— * * * * I believe, madam, that I have succeeded in getting the true dimensions of most of your faculties. They are all of them exceedingly well defined and prominent; your head is studded over like the coat of a pine-apple. If you would only strip off all your jewels and hair, and make your head as bare as a pumpkin, you would ravish the very soul of a phrenologist. Allow me now to take the dimensions of your amativeness, and I have done. Gentlemen, this is the most delightful part of mental philosophy. I never feel in brisker spirits than when exploring the faculties of a beautiful lady, searching them out among the rich glossy ringlets of her hair. Phrenology is truly a sublime science. What more elevating employment can one find, than gauging a lady's intellect, taking the elevation of her sentiments, and measuring the force of her propensities. Phrenology is altogether a more elevating science than animal magnetism, and if Col. Stone soared so high from taking hold barely of the hand of a handsome young lady, what might a young phrenologist be supposed to do who grasps her whole intellect?

Reverend sir, we are now prepared to proceed to you. Great numbers of your profession are constantly coming to us. We are greatly beholden to you for your countenance and influence. You are doing for us perhaps more than you are aware. They are apt to come to us skeptics, but we generally send them away warm phrenologists. Tell me now frankly, if I succeed in telling your true character to the most minute particular by phrenology, and convince you of its truth, are you willing to avow your convictions before this audience?

M. I will do it with all my heart, but first convince me.

P. I will now then proceed to measure the volume of your brain. An immense mass it is too, near as big as a

horse's! What a breadth of base! I will venture one observation before I go any further; you are a man of vast intellect and unshaken firmness of character.

M. Tell me now at the outset, have you not had some intimation with regard to me, from some quarter?

P. Rev. sir, I am doing it all by phrenology; let me proceed. Gentlemen, do you see this veneration? It absolutely disfigures your head. You must be a man of the most signal piety and gravity. The very dickens! what a charming little acquisitiveness; it is not bigger than the head of a pin, and here is benevolence as large as a hen's egg. Sir, you must be generous, compassionate and charitable to a fault; you must—

M. I believe I am like Saul, who consulted the witch of Endor.

P. Don't interrupt me. Here is self-esteem scarcely visible. Rev. sir, if any one should attempt to flatter you, you would fly at him like a tiger. I mean you would be as angry as a wasp; in short, you would never forgive him.

M. There you have me again.

P. My heart, what a conscientiousness! It is as big as a turnip. Sir, you would strain at a very gnat. You have firmness like a rock; cautiousness is absolutely concave; you have courage and fortitude to brave every danger and difficulty you can ever encounter.

M. This is either phrenology or witchcraft. Nobody could have told you these things, not even my wife. You know me sir, I verily believe, better than I know myself.

P. Here is ideality strong; you write elegantly.

M. You hit me every blow.

P. Large imitateness. You use a great deal of gesture. This organ inclines men to gesticulation. It is prominent in the French, very large in monkeys, parrots and young orators. Your intellect I said was vast. What inexhaustible stores of thought lie concealed here under my hand! Here lie the sentiments. A very *Ætna* of eloquence is under my fingers. Now, Rev. sir, I am coming to a crisis; will you answer my questions as I propose them?

M. Indeed I will.

P. Did you never long for a more extended field of usefulness?

M. A thousand times.

P. Did you never wish to outshine all your brethren far and near in doing good?

M. You know my very heart.

P. Did you never think yourself exactly fitted to fill some very high post in the church? and would you not be willing to fill such a place?

M. You know every inch of me.

P. Did you never, before you were twenty years old long for the friendship of some virtuous young lady?

M. Stay your hand; it is more than enough. My skepticism is all gone; you have demonstrated your science better than Euclid. You have learned more about me in five minutes than I have been able to learn in thirty years. If phrenology can make such discoveries as these, you may set down my name as a convert. I believe that it is as true as the gospel.



